arXiv:1610.01829v1 [quant-ph] 6 Oct 2016

Quantum and Information Thermodynamics: A Unifying Framework based on Repeated Interactions

Philipp Strasberg,* Gernot Schaller, and Tobias Brandes
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Berlin, Hardenbergstr. 36, D-10623 Berlin, Germany

Massimiliano Esposito
Complex Systems and Statistical Mechanics, Physics and Materials Science, University of Luxembourg, L-1511 Luxembourg, Luxembourg

(Dated: October 7, 2016)

We expand the standard thermodynamic framework of a system coupled to a thermal reservoir by considering a stream of independently prepared units repeatedly put into contact with the system. These units can be in any nonequilibrium state and interact with the system with an arbitrary strength and duration. We show that this stream constitutes an effective resource of nonequilibrium free energy and identify the conditions under which it behaves as a heat, work or information reservoir. We also show that this setup provides a natural framework to analyze information erasure ("Landauer's principle") and feedback controlled systems ("Maxwell's demon"). In the limit of a short system-unit interaction time, we further demonstrate that this setup can be used to provide a thermodynamically sound interpretation to many effective master equations. We discuss how non-autonomously driven systems, micromasers, lasing without inversion, and the electronic Maxwell demon, can be thermodynamically analyzed within our framework. While the present framework accounts for quantum features (e.g. squeezing, entanglement, coherence), we also show that quantum resources are *a priori* equally powerful as classical ones unless additional constraints are imposed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermodynamics was traditionally designed to understand the laws which govern the behavior of macroscopic systems at equilibrium in terms of few macroscopic variables (e.g., temperature, pressure, chemical potential, energy, volume, particle number, etc.) containing very limited information about the microscopic state of the system. Remarkable progress has been done over the last decades to understand under which conditions the laws of thermodynamics emerge for small-scale systems where quantum and stochastic effects dominate and which are usually far away from thermal equilibrium. A crucial discovery in that regard has been the discovery of universal fluctuation relations which replace the traditional second law formulated as an inequality by an exact symmetry that fluctuations must satisfy arbitrarily far from equilibrium [1–5]. Furthermore, whenever a (possibly time-dependently driven) system is weakly connected to large and fast thermal reservoirs, the resulting closed system dynamics – described by (quantum) master equations (ME) or Fokker-Planck equations – can be used as the basis to establish a consistent nonequilibrium thermodynamics [6–8]. This theory has been very successful to study small systems in a large variety of fields ranging from biophysics to electronics and many of its predictions have been verified experimentally [9–15].

Yet, many situations encountered nowadays in the realm of small systems require to go beyond the traditional framework of thermodynamics which describes driven systems in contact with thermal reservoirs operating at steady state or undergoing transformations between equilibrium states. Notable examples include the thermodynamic description of computation which involves transformations between nonequilibrium states [16, 17], information processing using feedback controls ("Maxwell demons") where different members of the statistical ensemble undergo different drivings [18–20], or interactions with reservoirs prepared in nonequilibrium states [21–26].

In this paper, we extend the traditional framework of thermodynamics by considering a system which, in addition of being in contact with a thermal reservoir, interacts with a stream of external systems which we call "units". Each independently prepared unit interacts for a certain time with the system before being replaced by another one and no additional assumption about the state of the units nor the system-unit interaction is required. In the most general picture, this stream of units will be shown to constitute a *resource of nonequilibrium free energy* modifying the traditional energetic and entropic balances. We will study the limits in which the stream of units effectively reproduces the effect of a heat, work or information reservoir. We will also explore limits giving rise to an effective closed dynamics for the system which still allows for a consistent thermodynamic description. We will focus on the ensemble averaged description and not on fluctuations.

The benefit of our generalized thermodynamic framework is that it provides a unified perspective and encompasses many previously considered setups. In modern physics, such setups have probably first been used in quantum optics, theoretically as well as experimentally, to model a maser in which a stream of atoms is injected

* phist@physik.tu-berlin.de

into a cavity in order to macroscopically populate it [27–29]. Such setups have also been used to stabilize photon number states via measurement based quantum feedback control [30]. In theoretical works, an "information reservoir" made of a stream of bits was proposed to extract work from a single heat reservoir [31, 32], a picture that also closely resembles a Turing machine [16, 33]. The setup is also close to resource theoretic formulations of thermodynamics, in which one investigates which system transformations are possible given a set of freely available states and resources (all other states) [34, 35]. Further analogies can be drawn with biomolecular motors or enzymes [10] which manipulate, e.g., nucleic acids (units) on a DNA strand, or with scattering theory where incoming and outgoing wave packets (units) interact for a short time with the scatterer (the system) [36, 37].

Outline

The structure of the paper and some of its main results are summarized in Fig. 1. We start very generally in Sec. II by considering two interacting systems and review under what conditions the laws of thermodynamics can be established if one of the systems is initially in a thermal state and plays the role of the reservoir while the other is the driven system of interest. Besides establishing notation, this section also sets the basis for Sec. III, were the system now also interacts with an external stream of units. Generalized laws of thermodynamics are established which show that the stream of units effectively constitutes a resource of nonequilibrium free energy. We then consider various limiting cases in Sec. IV where the stream of units respectively behaves as a heat, work and information reservoir. Furthermore, Landauer's principle is derived as well as a quantum version of the second law of thermodynamics under feedback control. We go one step further in Sec. V by considering scenarios leading to a closed reduced dynamics for the system when tracing out the units, but where one still retains a consistent thermodynamic description. More specifically, we consider the limit of infinitesimally short interactions which are either Poissonian or regularly distributed which lead to effective MEs, but we also analyze the limit where the units effectively generate a time-dependent Hamiltonian for the system. Specific models, apparently unrelated in the literature, are then analyzed within our unifying framework in the subsequent section (Sec. VI). These include the Mandal-Jarzynski engine, the micromaser, lasing without inversion where work is extracted from quantum coherence, and the electronic Maxwell demon. We finally close the paper with Sec. VII, where we first show that our generalized second law of thermodynamics does not conflict with the traditional Kelvin-Planck statement of the second law, we then prove that quantum thermodynamics offers *a priori* no advantages compared to classical thermodynamics within our framework, and we finally give a short summary and outlook.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1
Outline 2

II. Energy and entropy balance of an open quantum system 3
A. Two interacting systems 3
B. System coupled to a thermal reservoir 4
C. The weak coupling limit and master equations 5

III. Thermodynamics of repeated interactions 6
A. Idea 6
B. Formal setup 6
C. Modified energy and entropy balance 7

IV. Implications 8
A. Thermal units and ideal heat reservoir 8
B. Work reservoir 9
C. Information reservoir 9
D. Landauer's principle 10
E. The second law of thermodynamics for discrete feedback control 11

V. Infinitesimal interaction times and effective master equations 12
A. Poisson-distributed interaction times 13
1. Setup 13
2. Thermodynamics 14
3. Heat, work and information dominated interactions 15
B. Regular and frequent interaction intervals 16
1. Setup 16
2. Thermodynamics 16
C. Mimicking time-dependent Hamiltonians 17
1. Setup 17
2. Thermodynamics 18

VI. Applications 18
A. The Mandal-Jarzynski engine 18
B. The micromaser 19
C. Lasing without inversion and extracting work from quantum coherence 20
D. Electronic Maxwell demon 21

VII. Discussions and Conclusions 23
A. Connection to traditional thermodynamics 23
B. Quantum versus Classical Thermodynamics 24
C. Summary and outlook 25
Acknowledgements 26

References 26



FIG. 1. (Color Online) Overview of the structure of the article covering its main results and applications. Here and in the following, $E_{S,U}$, $S_{S,U}$ and $F_{S,U}$ denote the energy, entropy and non-equilibrium free energy of the system (S) or unit (U). Q is the heat flowing from the reservoir at inverse temperature $\beta = T^{-1}$ ($k_B \equiv 1$) and W is the work done on the system. Furthermore, we use Σ_S to denote the entropy production and $I_{S:U}$ denotes the mutual information between system and unit. The picture of the Mandal-Jarzynski engine was taken from Ref. [31].

II. ENERGY AND ENTROPY BALANCE OF AN OPEN QUANTUM SYSTEM

A. Two interacting systems

To introduce important concepts and notation, we start by considering two interacting systems X and Y, which are initially (at time $t = 0$) decorrelated, i.e.,

$$\rho_{XY}(0) = \rho_X(0) \otimes \rho_Y(0) \equiv \rho_X(0)\rho_Y(0). \tag{1}$$

Here, ρ_{XY} denotes the density operator of the compound system X and Y whereas ρ_X (ρ_Y) describes the reduced state of X (Y). In order to make a statement about the first law of thermodynamics, we associate a Hamiltonian to the setup which we decompose as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm tot}(t) &= H_X(t) \otimes \mathbf{1}_Y + \mathbf{1}_X \otimes H_Y(t) + H_{XY}(t) \\ &\equiv H_X(t) + H_Y(t) + H_{XY}(t). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, $\mathbf{1}_X$ ($\mathbf{1}_Y$) denotes the identity on the Hilbert space of system X (Y), which we usually suppress to simplify notation, and $H_{XY}(t)$ describes the interaction between system X and Y. Furthermore, all terms can, in principle, be explicitly time-dependent.

The time evolution of the compound system is governed by the Liouville-von Neumann equation $d_t\rho_{XY}(t) = -i[H_{\rm tot}(t), \rho_{XY}(t)]$ ($\hbar \equiv 1$ throughout the text). Introducing the unitary time evolution operator $U_t \equiv \mathcal{T}_+ \exp\left[-i\int_0^t ds H_{\rm tot}(s)\right]$ (where $\mathcal{T}_+$ denotes the time ordering operator), the state of the compound system at time τ is given by

$$\rho_{XY}(\tau) = U_\tau \rho_X(0)\rho_Y(0)U_\tau^\dagger, \tag{3}$$

which is in general correlated.

To obtain the reduced state of system X, we must trace over system Y. Using the spectral decomposition of the initial density matrix of system Y, $\rho_Y(0) = \sum_l p_l |l\rangle_Y\langle l|$, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_X(\tau) &= {\rm tr}_Y\{\rho_{XY}(\tau)\} \\ &= \sum_{kl} T_{kl}\rho_X(0)T_{kl}^\dagger \equiv \Phi_X(\tau)\rho_X(0) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $T_{kl} \equiv \sqrt{p_l}\langle k|U_\tau|l\rangle_Y$. The T_{kl} are still operators in the Hilbert space of system X and fulfill the completeness relation

$$\sum_{kl} T_{kl}^\dagger T_{kl} = \mathbf{1}_X. \tag{5}$$

The map $\Phi_X(\tau)$ in Eq. (4) is known as a Kraus map or quantum operation and it is the most general map (preserving the density matrix properties) for a quantum system which was initially uncorrelated [38–41]. We note that the representation of Φ_X in terms of the Kraus operators T_{kl} is *not* unique.

The energy of the compound system at any point in time is $E_{XY}(t) \equiv {\rm tr}_{XY}\{H_{\rm tot}(t)\rho_{XY}(t)\}$. Because the compound system is isolated, the dynamics is unitary and

the energy change is solely due to the time dependence in the Hamiltonian and can thus be identified as work

$$d_t E_{XY}(t) = \mathrm{tr}_{XY}\left\{\rho_{XY}(t) d_t H_{\mathrm{tot}}(t)\right\} \equiv \dot{W}. \tag{6}$$

The rate of work injection $\dot{W}$ is positive if it increases the energy of the compound system. Eq. (6) is the first law of thermodynamics for an *isolated* system.

Finally, we have a look at the entropic balances. We define the von Neumann entropy of a system X, which we interpret as a measure for our lack of knowledge about the state ρ_X, as usual by

$$S_X \equiv -\mathrm{tr}_X\{\rho_X \ln \rho_X\}. \tag{7}$$

Note that we will sometimes also use the notation $S(\rho_X) \equiv S_X$ to make the dependence on a particular density matrix explicit. Because the joint von Neumann entropy $S_{XY}(t) \equiv -\mathrm{tr}_{XY}\{\rho_{XY}(t) \ln \rho_{XY}(t)\}$ does not change under unitary time evolution, we have $S_{XY}(\tau) = S_{XY}(0)$. We further introduce the (quantum) mutual information

$$I_{X:Y}(t) \equiv S_X(t) + S_Y(t) - S_{XY}(t) \geq 0\,, \tag{8}$$

which measures the amount of correlations shared between X and Y. For the initially decorrelated state (1) we have $S_{XY}(0) = S_X(0) + S_Y(0)$. Hence, in terms of the mutual information we can write

$$\Delta S_X(\tau) + \Delta S_Y(\tau) = I_{X:Y}(\tau). \tag{9}$$

Thus, the mutual information tells us how the sum of the marginal entropies $\Delta S_X(\tau) \equiv S_X(\tau) - S_X(0)$ and $\Delta S_Y(\tau) \equiv S_Y(\tau) - S_Y(0)$ can change.

Later on, it will be also useful to have the concept of relative entropy, defined via

$$D(\rho||\sigma) \equiv \mathrm{tr}\{\rho(\ln \rho - \ln \sigma)\} \geq 0, \tag{10}$$

where ρ and σ are two density matrices and positivity follows from Klein's inequality [39]. With the help of relative entropy we can also prove the positivity of mutual information since

$$I_{X:Y}(t) = D[\rho_{XY}(t)||\rho_X(t)\rho_Y(t)]. \tag{11}$$

Note that relative entropy is not symmetric, i.e., $D(\rho||\sigma) \neq D(\sigma||\rho)$ in general, but mutual information fulfills $I_{X:Y} = I_{Y:X}$. Furthermore, it is important to mention that the action of any Kraus map Φ can never increase the relative entropy [40, 42], i.e.,

$$D(\Phi\rho||\Phi\sigma) \leq D(\rho||\sigma). \tag{12}$$

B. System coupled to a thermal reservoir

To make further contact with thermodynamics we now consider the case where the system Y plays the role of a thermal reservoir in a sense defined below. Similar treatments were presented in Refs. [43–45]. For this purpose we relabel Y by R and assume first of all that the Hamiltonian H_R is time-independent. This allows us to reformulate the first law (6) as follows.

We define the quantity

$$\dot{Q}(t) \equiv -\mathrm{tr}_R\left\{H_R d_t \rho_R(t)\right\}, \tag{13}$$

which we interpret as the heat flow into the system X at time t (positive if it increases the system energy), and include the system-reservoir interaction $V_{XR}(t)$ into the definition of the internal energy of the system X,

$$E_X(t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}_{XR}\{[H_X(t) + V_{XR}(t)]\rho_{XR}(t)\}. \tag{14}$$

Then, from the energy balance (6) we obtain

$$d_t E_X(t) = \dot{W}(t) + \dot{Q}(t) \tag{15}$$

which is the first law of thermodynamics of a closed system. We emphasize that we are using the conventional terminology of thermodynamics here where a system exchanging only energy (but not matter) with a reservoir is called "closed" though one would rather call it "open" from the perspective of open quantum system theory. An "open" system in the thermodynamic sense (exchanging also matter with its environment) can be considered by introducing a chemical potential for reservoir R, which is then described by an initial grand canonical equilibrium state.

Finally, integrating the first law over an interval $[0, \tau]$ gives

$$\Delta E_X(\tau) = E_X(\tau) - E_X(0) = W(\tau) + Q(\tau) \tag{16}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} W(\tau) &\equiv \int_0^\tau dt \dot{W}(t) = E_{XR}(\tau) - E_{XR}(0) \\ Q(\tau) &\equiv \int_0^\tau dt \dot{Q}(t) = -\mathrm{tr}_R\{H_R[\rho_R(\tau) - \rho_R(0)]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

To make further progress we now assume that the initial state of R is a Gibbs state at inverse temperature $\beta = T^{-1}$ ($k_B \equiv 1$ throughout the paper),

$$\rho_R(0) = \rho_\beta^R \equiv \frac{e^{-\beta H_R}}{Z_R}, \quad Z_R = \mathrm{tr}(e^{-\beta H_R}), \tag{18}$$

which allows us to establish the second law of thermodynamics.

In fact, for a macroscopic reservoir R the second law of thermodynamics states that there is an always positive quantity $\Sigma \geq 0$, which is called the entropy production and characterizes the irreversibility of the dynamics. We here follow the suggestion of Ref. [43] and define the entropy production as

$$\Sigma(\tau) \equiv \Delta S_X(\tau) - \beta Q(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{19}$$

This equation has the standard form known from phenomenological nonequilibrium thermodynamics [46] although it is also valid when R is of finite size and would thus not be considered as a traditional reservoir. The positivity of Σ follows by noting the identities [43]

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma(\tau) &= D[\rho_{XR}(\tau)||\rho_X(\tau)\otimes\rho_\beta^R] \\ &= D[\rho_R(\tau)||\rho_\beta^R] + I_{X:R}(\tau),\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

which allows us to interpret the entropy production as the sum of the deviation of the final reservoir state from the idealized Gibbs state and the build up of correlations between system and reservoir. Furthermore, it will turn out to be useful to introduce the concept of a *nonequilibrium free energy*. Following Refs. [43, 47–49], we define

$$F_X(t) \equiv E_X(t) - TS_X(t) \tag{21}$$

where T is the (thermostatic) temperature of the initial reservoir attached to the system. Since this is fixed, $dF_X(t)$ is still an exact differential. Using this quantity, we can write the second law as

$$\Sigma(\tau) = \beta[W(\tau) - \Delta F_X(\tau)] \geq 0. \tag{22}$$

Explicit processes where $\Sigma(\tau)$ can be made arbitrarily close to zero have been considered by Reeb and Wolf in Sec. 6 of Ref. [45].

C. The weak coupling limit and master equations

The results above provide a general way to formally derive the laws of thermodynamics as exact identities. Remarkably, these relations hold even if the reservoir R is arbitrarily small and strongly influenced by the presence of the system. However, while the entropy production $\Sigma(\tau)$ is proven to be nonnegative, its rate can be negative. In fact, as finite-size quantum systems evolve quasi-periodically, the exact rate of entropy production must become negative at some time to restore the initial state. Furthermore, these identities are also of limited practical use because computing any particular expression requires to solve the full Liouville-von Neumann dynamics for the joint system and reservoir.

The weak coupling limit between the system and the reservoir circumvents these limitations and is of great practical relevance. It has been used since a long time to study quantum thermodynamics [50, 51] (see also Refs. [6, 8] for recent reviews). Within this limit the system does not perturb the reservoir over any relevant time-scale and it is further assumed that the reservoir behaves memory-less (i.e., Markovian). Then, this allows to close the equation of motion for the system density matrix $\rho_X(t)$. The resulting dynamics is called a (quantum) master equation (ME). In this limit, the general results of Sec. II B reduce to the well-known ME formulation of quantum thermodynamics [43], where all thermodynamic quantities can be expressed solely in terms of system operators.

More specifically, after applying the Born-Markov-secular approximations [1, 6, 7, 50, 52] which is usually justified in the weak coupling limit, the ME can be put into the form

$$\begin{aligned}d_t\rho_X(t) &= -i[H_X(t),\rho_X(t)] + \mathcal{L}_\beta(t)\rho_X(t) \\ &\equiv \mathcal{L}_X(t)\rho_X(t).\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

More explicit forms for this type of equation will follow. The superoperator $\mathcal{L}_X(t)$ is called the Liouvillian and acts linearly on the space of system operators. It generates the time evolution of the system according to the map

$$\rho_X(\tau) = \mathcal{T}_+ \exp\left[\int_0^\tau ds\mathcal{L}_X(s)\right]\rho_X(0) \tag{24}$$

or simply $\rho_X(\tau) = e^{\mathcal{L}_X\tau}\rho_X(0)$ if $\mathcal{L}_X$ is time-independent. Furthermore, it can be shown that the Born-Markov-secular ME has a special form known as a Lindblad ME [53, 54], which means that Eq. (24) can be written as a Kraus map (4). Thus, whereas each Lindblad ME defines a particular Kraus map, the inverse is not necessarily true, i.e., for a given Kraus map we cannot associate a unique ME in Lindblad form.

The contact with thermodynamics is established by noting that the dissipator or thermal generator $\mathcal{L}_\beta(t)$ in Eq. (23) satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(t)\rho_\beta^X(t) = 0, \quad \rho_\beta^X(t) = \frac{e^{-\beta H_X(t)}}{Z_X(t)}. \tag{25}$$

This ensures that the system stationary state is the equilibrium state of the system and follows from the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger (KMS) property of the reservoir correlation functions [1, 6, 7, 50, 52]. Furthermore, it can be shown that for a non-degenerate system Hamiltonian, the dynamics for the populations in the system eigenbasis satisfies a ME of the Pauli-type governed by transition rates W_{ij} to go from state j to state i which satisfy [7, 50, 52]

$$\ln\frac{W_{ij}}{W_{ji}} = -\beta(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j), \tag{26}$$

where ϵ_i is the eigenenergy of state i. This property is known as *local detailed balance* and is also used as a starting point to establish a consistent nonequilibrium thermodynamics for classical stochastic processes [4, 5].

Since the system-reservoir interaction is now negligible, the system energy reads $E_X(t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}\{H_X(t)\rho_X(t)\}$ and the first law takes the usual form,

$$d_tE_X(t) = \dot{W}(t) + \dot{Q}(t), \tag{27}$$

where the work rate on the system is given by

$$\dot{W}(t) = \mathrm{tr}_X\{\rho_X(t)d_tH_X(t)\} \tag{28}$$

and the heat flow into the system is caused by the dissipative part of the evolution

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{Q}(t) &= \mathrm{tr}_X\left\{H_X(t)d_t\rho_X(t)\right\}\\ &= \mathrm{tr}_X\{H_X(t)\mathcal{L}_X(t)\rho_X(t)\}.\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

The second law is now more stringent since it not only ensures the nonnegativity of the entropy production but also of its *rate* $\dot{\Sigma}(t)$,

$$\dot{\Sigma}(t) = d_t S_X(t) - \beta\dot{Q}(t) \geq 0. \tag{30}$$

Mathematically, this result follows from Spohn's inequality [55]

$$-\mathrm{tr}\{[\mathcal{L}_X(t)\rho_X(t)][\ln\rho_X(t) - \ln\bar{\rho}_X(t)]\} \geq 0. \tag{31}$$

This is true for any Liouvillian $\mathcal{L}_X(t)$ of Lindblad form with steady state $\bar{\rho}_X(t)$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_X(t)\bar{\rho}_X(t) = 0$, and corresponds to the differential version of Eq. (12). For the case considered here, we have $\bar{\rho}_X(t) = \rho^X_\beta(t)$ [see Eq. (25)] and Spohn's inequality gives after a straightforward manipulation (30).

It should be noted that a rigorous derivation of the ME (23) does not only require a weak coupling to a large thermal and memoryless reservoir, but also assumes that the driving of $H_X(t)$ is relatively slow (although not necessarily adiabatic [56, 57]). Other MEs can be derived for (strong) periodic driving using Floquet theory [6, 8, 52] and also give rise to a consistent nonequilibrium thermodynamics [6, 8, 58, 59]. If the driving is neither slow nor periodic, no method is currently known to derive a ME although the thermodynamic quantities defined above remain meaningful, also see Ref. [60].

III. THERMODYNAMICS OF REPEATED INTERACTIONS

A. Idea

Traditionally, establishing a thermodynamic framework for nanoscale devices is possible for static, macroscopically large reservoirs kept at thermal equilibrium as reviewed in the preceeding section. However, as motivated in the introduction, many experimental (and theoretical) setups today do not fit into this picture and make use of much more subtle resources. For instance, a micromaser (as reviewed in Sec. VI B) makes use of a stream of flying atoms prepared in non-equilibrium states interacting sequentially with a cavity. Another example could be the measurement (and subsequent manipulation) of the device by an external observer ("Maxwell's demon"), see Secs. IV E and VI D.

Although both examples are quite different, we will see that we can treat them within one unified framework by introducing a new form of "reservoir" which can be prepared in arbitrary non-equilbrium states. The basic setup consists of a stream of additional systems, which we will generically call "units", which are identically and independently prepared and which one after another interact with the device (i.e., the system of interest) without ever coming back. This framework of repeated interactions, provides sufficient structure to formulate a meaningful and tractable dynamics and thermodynamics, as will be shown in Secs. III B and III C.

B. Formal setup

The system X that we considered until now is split in two as $X = S \oplus U$, where S denotes the system of interest whereas U is an auxiliary system called the unit. We assume that this unit interacts with the system S for a time τ' and is afterwards decoupled from it and replaced at time $\tau > \tau'$ by a new unit. This new unit interacts with S from τ to $\tau + \tau'$ before it is replaced by yet another new unit at 2τ. The process is then repeated over and over. This means that the system is interacting sequentially with a stream of units $\{U_n\}$, where the index n refers to the n'th interaction taking place in the interval $[n\tau, n\tau + \tau)$ as sketched in Fig. 2.

The Hamiltonian $H_X(t)$ of the joint system and *all* units can be formally written as

$$H_X(t) = H_S(t) + H_U + H_{SU}(t). \tag{32}$$

In principle, the system Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$ could have an arbitrary time dependence, but we will demand in the following $H_S(t) = H_S(t+\tau)$ such that it is safe to assume that the system reaches a periodic steady state (see the discussion around Eq. (36)). The Hamiltonian of the stream of (non-interacting) units can be written as a sum of (time-independent) single unit Hamiltonians $H_U^{(n)}$

$$H_U = \sum_n H_U^{(n)} \tag{33}$$

and the system-unit interaction can be written as

$$H_{SU}(t) = \sum_n \Theta(t - n\tau)\Theta(n\tau + \tau' - t)V_{SU}^{(n)}(t), \tag{34}$$

where $V_{SU}^{(n)}(t)$ is an arbitrary interaction between the system and the n'th unit. The Heaviside step function explicitly reads

$$\Theta(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \geq 0,\\ 0 & \text{if } t < 0.\end{cases} \tag{35}$$

This means that the interaction between the system and the n'th unit is switched on at time $t = n\tau$ and switched off at $t = n\tau + \tau'$ with $0 < \tau' < \tau$ as explained above. During this interaction time the system and unit are both coupled to the reservoir R. Their dynamics can be described exactly or by a ME of the form (23) in the weak coupling limit. However, before or after the interaction



FIG. 2. (Color Online) Sketch of a stream of units interacting with a system in contact with a heat reservoir at inverse temperature β. The lower panel shows the switching on and off of the system-unit interaction as a function of time. Note that τ denotes the full interaction period whereas the system and unit are only physically coupled during a time τ'.

with the system, when the unit is *not in contact* with the system, it will evolve freely (i.e., unitarily) with $H_U^{(n)}$ and its energy $E_U^{(n)}(t) = \mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{H_U^{(n)}\rho_U^{(n)}(t)\}$ and entropy $S_U^{(n)}(t) = -\mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{\rho_U^{(n)}(t)\ln\rho_U^{(n)}(t)\}$ will remain constant.

Our setup is meant to model situations where an experimentalist can prepare independent units in any desired state. Therefore, a crucial but reasonable assumption that we use is that the incoming units are decorrelated (i.e., independently prepared[1]) and that their statistical description is stationary in time, i.e., the density matrix of the incoming units fulfills $\rho_U^{(n)}(n\tau) = \rho_U^{(m)}(m\tau)$ for any n, m.[2] We further assume that the interaction Hamiltonian $V_{SU}^{(n)}(t)$ has always the same form (of course it acts on different unit Hilbert spaces but for simplicity we will always denote it by $V_{SU}(t)$). Under these conditions, it is reasonable to expect that an arbitrary initial system state will eventually relax into a periodic steady state where its statistical description does not change from one interaction interval to the next, i.e.,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}[\rho_S(t+\tau) - \rho_S(t)] = 0, \tag{36}$$

where $\rho_S(t) = \mathrm{tr}_U\{\rho_X(t)\}$. In the steady state regime it is then justified to drop the index "n" on all quantities and we are allowed to pick an arbitrary time interval of length τ for our description. Thus, as a representative time interval we pick $[0,\tau)$ and the condition for a periodic steady state of the system then reads

$$\rho_S(0) = \rho_S(\tau) \tag{37}$$

[1] We will discuss correlations briefly in Sec. VII C.

[2] In Sec. V C we will consider an application where this assumption is not fulfilled.

together with the initial condition $\rho_X(0) = \rho_S(0)\rho_U(0)$ and where $\rho_S(t) = \mathrm{tr}_U\{\rho_X(t)\}$ requires to trace out only a single unit. Note that the solution of Eq. (37) will in general require to deduce the full ME (23) for the *combined system* X. This will change in Sec. V where we will deduce MEs for the system only.

Our goal will now be to formulate thermodynamic laws for the system where one regards the stream of units as a nonequilibrium reservoir, and to understand to what extend this latter modifies the traditional thermodynamic laws.

C. Modified energy and entropy balance

To obtain the first law of thermodynamics we can either take Eq. (16) or integrate Eq. (27), where care has to be taken with the definition of the time interval to correctly capture boundary effects. The global change of system and unit energy just before the interaction is turned on and turned off (so that the interaction term does not contribute) is given by

$$\Delta E_{SU} \equiv \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\int_{-\epsilon}^{\tau-\epsilon} dt\frac{dE_X(t)}{dt} = \Delta E_S + \Delta E_U, \tag{38}$$

where $\Delta E_S = \mathrm{tr}_S\{H_S(\tau)\rho_S(\tau)\} - \mathrm{tr}_S\{H_S(0)\rho_S(0)\}$ and analogously for ΔE_U. Integrating the rate of work yields two terms

$$W \equiv \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\int_{-\epsilon}^{\tau-\epsilon} dt\dot{W}(t) = W_X + W_{\mathrm{sw}}. \tag{39}$$

The first term is standard and results from the smooth time-dependence of $H_S(t)$ during the full interval and of $V_{SU}(t)$ during the interaction, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} W_X = &\int_0^{\tau} dt\mathrm{tr}_X\{\rho_X(t)d_tH_S(t)\} \\ &+ \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\int_{\epsilon}^{\tau'-\epsilon} dt'\mathrm{tr}_X\{\rho_X(t)d_tV_{SU}(t)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The second term, to which we will refer as the switching work, is a boundary term resulting from the sudden switching on and off of the interaction and reads

$$W_{\mathrm{sw}} = \mathrm{tr}_X\{V_{SU}(0)\rho_X(0) - V_{SU}(\tau')\rho_X(\tau')\}. \tag{41}$$

Mathematically, it follows from $d_t\Theta(t) = \delta(t)$ where $\delta(t)$ is a Dirac delta distribution. Physically, we can interpret W_{sw} as the *work needed to pull the stream of units along the system* (we assume that the other units which do not interact with the system move in a frictionless way). Finally, by integrating the heat flow [Eqs. (17) or (29)] we get

$$Q \equiv \lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\int_{-\epsilon}^{\tau-\epsilon} dt\dot{Q}(t), \tag{42}$$

and the first law of thermodynamics takes the form

$$\Delta E_S = W + Q - \Delta E_U. \tag{43}$$

At steady state for the system we have $\Delta E_S = 0$.

Using the second law of thermodynamics, Eq. (19) or Eq. (30) as well as the factorization of the initial condition $\rho_X(0) = \rho_S(0)\rho_U(0)$, the entropy production of the system *and* unit during each interaction period reads

$$\Sigma = \Delta S_S + \Delta S_U - I_{S:U}(\tau) - \beta Q \geq 0. \tag{44}$$

where the unit entropy change ΔS_U and the final system-unit correlations $I_{S:U}(\tau)$ modify what would otherwise be the traditional second law for the system in contact with its reservoir. While ΔS_U has no definite sign and may be used as a resource for the system, within our setup the correlation $I_{S:U}(\tau)$ is a nonnegative term which can never be used as a resource and will always remain unused and eventually wasted.[3] In fact, to derive our results it was crucial that the initial state of the system and unit before the interaction *factorizes*. If we allow eventually still correlated outgoing units to interact with the system again, we need to keep track of these units (including the correlations), too, and the initial product state assumption would not be justified anymore. This motivates us to introduce another always positive term

$$\Sigma_S \equiv \Sigma + I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0, \tag{45}$$

which can be seen as a system-specific entropy production. It takes into account the *additional* dissipation ($\Sigma_S \geq \Sigma$) associated with the imposed unidirectionality in our setup. In the following we will mostly use Σ_S but keep the $I_{S:U}(\tau)$ explicit.

Using the first law (43) together with the definition of the nonequilibrium free energy (21) with respect to the reservoir temperature β, (45) can be rewritten as

$$\Sigma_S = \beta(W - \Delta F_S - \Delta F_U) \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{46}$$

At steady state for the system $\Delta F_S = 0$. This form of the modified second law allows us to draw the important conclusion that the stream of units in its most general sense is nothing else than a resource of nonequilibrium free energy.

Thus, as a quick summary, allowing a system to interact with a stream of units in the way specified above causes changed energetic and entropic balances and allows to establish a modified first and second law in a clean way. Furthermore, the changes ΔE_U and ΔS_U (and ΔF_U) should be easily accessible by measuring the state of the incoming and outgoing units. As to whether ΔE_U and ΔS_U can be linked to traditional thermodynamic notions of work or heat as well as particular implications will be examined in the next section.

Finally, as we have emphasized at the beginning of this section, we are in general required to solve the full ME (or any other evolution equation) for the system *and* unit in order to compute any quantity for a particular situation. Especially, there is in general no ME for the system alone. Again, as for the general treatment in Sec. II B, this can be cumbersome, especially if the system and unit are complicated systems by themselves. Sec. V therefore shows how to obtain an effective equation for the system only, together with a consistent thermodynamic interpretation for various limiting cases of the interaction $H_{SU}(t)$ considered above.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

A. Thermal units and ideal heat reservoir

We assume now that the units are initially prepared in an equilibrium state at an inverse temperature β': $\rho_U(0) = \rho^U_{\beta'} = e^{-\beta' H_U}/Z_U$. It is then straightforward to show the relation

$$\Delta E_U = T' \Delta S_U + T' D[\rho_U(\tau)||\rho^U_{\beta'}]\,. \tag{47}$$

Using this in (21), we find that

$$\Delta F_U = T D[\rho_U(\tau)||\rho^U_{\beta'}] + \left(1 - \frac{T}{T'}\right)\Delta E_U. \tag{48}$$

Therefore, the entropy production (44) at steady state reads ($\Delta F_S = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_S - I_{S:U}(\tau) = \beta \left[W - \left(1 - \frac{T}{T'}\right)\Delta E_U\right] \\ - D[\rho_U(\tau)||\rho^U_{\beta'}] - I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

The first line contribution is the one expected from a system in contact with two heat reservoirs at different temperature. The second one is made of two negative terms, which together can also be rewritten as $D[\rho_{SU}(\tau)||\rho_S \rho^U_{\beta'}]$. They measure the dissipation caused by the interaction with the units. When both terms vanish, the tape mimics an ideal heat reservoir. An explicit process where this can happen in the limit of many interactions is given in Sec. 6 of Ref. [45] by Reeb and Wolf.

With using (47) in the ideal heat reservoir limit we recover the Clausius relation

$$\frac{\Delta S_U}{\Delta E_U} = \frac{1}{T'} \quad \text{(ideal heat reservoir)}, \tag{50}$$

where it is now justified to identify the change in unit energy as heat, i.e., $\Delta E_U = -Q_U$. The second law (49) can then be rewritten as $-\beta Q - \beta' Q_U \geq 0$.

[3] Using Eq. (12), it is indeed possible to see that $I_{S:U}(\tau)$ cannot increase during the subsequent evolution. However, explicitly stating the conditions when they decrease (and do not stay constant) requires a detailed and non-trivial analysis of the system, unit and reservoir interactions. A precise mathematical condition for the equality in Eq. (12) was worked out in Ref. [61].

We now treat our device as a heat engine and suppose that $T' > T$. To extract work ($W < 0$), the second law dictates that $\Delta E_U < 0$ and the efficiency of our device can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &\equiv \frac{-W}{-\Delta E_U} \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{T}{T'} - T\frac{D[\rho_U(\tau)||\rho^U_{\beta'}] + I_{S:U}(\tau)}{-\Delta E_U} \\ &\leq 1 - \frac{T}{T'}.\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

We observe that, if the units are initially prepared in thermal equilibrium, our device cannot be more efficient than a Carnot engine due to the non-ideality of the final state. For $\beta = \beta'$ no work extraction is possible.

However, generalizing thermodynamics by considering a stream of units is powerful precisely because we are not restricted to consider units initially at equilibrium. Any initial *nonequilibrium* state can be considered such as for instance an initial state $\rho^U_{\beta'}$ with negative β'. The efficiency of the heat engine can then formally even *exceed* 1 *without violating the second law of thermodynamics* because the global entropy production (44) is still positive. However, in this case – as the work output has to be compared with the total energy put into the system – the first law of thermodynamics tells us that a correctly defined efficiency would still be bound by one.

B. Work reservoir

To make the units act as a work source, we should engineer their state and interaction with the system in such a way that only energy is exchanged but not entropy. Thus, we define

$$\frac{\Delta S_U}{\Delta E_U} \to 0 \quad \text{(ideal work reservoir)}. \tag{52}$$

For finite ΔE_U this implies that the change in nonequilibrium free energy is given by $\Delta F_U = \Delta E_U$ and (46) becomes at steady state ($\Delta F_S = 0$)

$$\Sigma_S = \beta(W - \Delta E_U) \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{53}$$

This means that we can extract work by decreasing the energy of the units. Note, however, that this procedure merely corresponds to a reshuffling of energy. As Eq. (53) immediately tells us as well, it is impossible to obtain a net energy extraction $W - \Delta E_U < 0$ from a single heat reservoir. Definition (52) can be fulfilled for many different situations depending on the precise nature of the interaction and the state and Hamiltonian of the units (we will treat particular examples in Secs. V A 3, V C and VI B).

Let us note that for the special case of an ideal heat reservoir which is thermal before and after the interaction (as discussed above), the form of Eqs. (52) and (53) can be obtained by choosing $T' \to \infty$ in Eqs. (49) and (50). This confirms the colloquial saying that a work reservoir corresponds to an infinite temperature heat reservoir. [4]

Finally, we note that the notion of work for small systems is subtle and has been debated [2, 63–70]. This originates from the desire to explain work microscopically in contrast to the standard approach where it is usually incorporated "by hand" as a time-dependent part of the system Hamiltonian. We see that the repeated interaction framework brings an interesting perspective on this issue by defining work as the part of the energy exchange that does not induce any entropy change in the units. This approach agrees with the point of view advertised in Refs. [65, 66, 68]. In Sec. V C, we will provide an explicit model where the units effectively mimic a time-dependent system Hamiltonian and fulfill Eq. (52).

C. Information reservoir

We now consider the regime where the units operate as a pure information source by demanding that the exchange of energy ΔE_U vanishes whereas the exchange of entropy ΔS_U remains finite. Thus, in contrast to Eq. (52), we demand that

$$\left(\frac{\Delta S_U}{\Delta E_U}\right)^{-1} \to 0 \quad \text{(ideal information reservoir)}. \tag{54}$$

Then, $\Delta F_U = -T\Delta S_U$ and the second law of thermodynamics (46) becomes at steady state ($\Delta F_S = 0$)

$$\Sigma_S = \beta W + \Delta S_U \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{55}$$

This shows that it is possible to extract work ($W < 0$) while writing information to the units ($\Delta S_U > 0$) in an energy neutral fashion ($\Delta E_U = 0$). Note that for this interpretation we have tacitly equated the entropy of a system with its *information content* in spirit of Shannon's fundamental work [71]. Engines which are able to extract work only at the expense of information are also called *information-driven engines* [72].

The idea that an information reservoir represents the opposite of a work reservoir also becomes manifest by considering the case of an ideal heat reservoir in the limit $T' \to 0$. Rearranging Eq. (48) yields

$$\frac{\Delta E_U}{T'} = \Delta S_U + D[\rho_U(\tau)||\rho^U_{\beta'}]. \tag{56}$$

In the limit of an ideal reservoir the second term on the right-hand side becomes negligibly small. However, in

[4] To quote Sommerfeld (p. 36 in [62]): "*Thermodynamics investigates the conditions that govern the transformation of heat into work. It teaches us to recognize temperature as the measure of the work-value of heat. Heat of higher temperature is richer, is capable of doing more work. Work may be regarded as heat of an infinitely high temperature, as unconditionally available heat.*"



FIG. 3. (Color Online) Venn diagram of how the thermodynamics is affected by the stream of units. In general, the interaction can be arbitrary, but if the initial state of the units is thermal, they can mimic an ideal heat reservoir when they fulfill the Clausius equality (50). In the limiting case of $T' \to \infty$ we obtain a work reservoir (Sec. IV B) though the converse is not true, i.e., not every work reservoir can be necessarily deduced as a limiting case of a heat reservoir. Similarly, we can obtain an information reservoir (Sec. IV C) out of a heat reservoir for $T' \to 0$, but again the converse is not true.

order to keep ΔS_U finite while $T' \to 0$ we automatically see that we obtain the requirement $\Delta E_U \to 0$. This can be achieved, for instance, by scaling the Hamiltonian of the units as $H_U = T'\tilde{H}_U$ (note that $\tilde{H}_U$ is dimensionless now). The same conclusion was also reached in Ref. [73].

The notion of an "information reservoir" was first introduced by Deffner and Jarzynski [44]. Their treatment, however, corresponds to a coarse-grained picture in which the informational states are macroscopic and a rapid equilibration mechanism of the microscopic degrees of freedom due to a heat reservoir is assumed. It therefore remains unclear whether a change in the informational state of the reservoir is accompanied by an energetic change or not. The thermodynamics of information reservoirs has attracted a lot of attention recently as number of model studies shows [31, 32, 73–80]. In Sec. VI A we will propose a microscopic model for the Mandal-Jarzynski engine [31] where the extracted work is shown to correspond to $W_{\rm sw}$ (41).

An overview of the the last three sections is presented in Fig. 3.

D. Landauer's principle

Landauer's principle colloquially states that logically irreversible computation, more specifically the erasure of a bit, has a fundamental work cost. This result was first derived for a particular model by Landauer in 1961 [81]. Since then many groups have made its statement more precise by deriving it from a more general context and by extending it to finite-time operations [16, 17, 45, 49, 82–90]. The modern understanding is that this principle immediately follows from the nonequilibrium version of the second law as we will show below. There is also growing experimental evidence in favor of it [91–96]. Nevertheless it remains debated [97].

Within our framework, Landauer's principle can be formulated as follows: *Changing the information content (that is to say the Shannon or von Neumann entropy) of a unit by $-\Delta S_U > 0$ requires a work expenditure of at least:*

$$\beta(W - \Delta E_U) \geq -\Delta S_U > 0, \tag{57}$$

This statement immediately follows from our generalized second law (46) where $\Delta E_S = 0$ because we focus on steady state for the system. Note that, since $-\Delta S_U = S_U(0) - S_U(\tau) > 0$, we are indeed *erasing* information, i.e., we lower the Shannon or von Neumann entropy of the unit. Furthermore, we see that we recover the standard statement $\beta W \geq -\Delta S_U$ for $\Delta E_U = 0$, which is automatically fulfilled if the states of the units are energetically degenerate as it is usually assumed (treatments including energetic changes can be found in Refs. [49, 87] and are in agreement with our result).

We emphasize that the initial product state of the system and unit, $\rho_X(0) = \rho_S(0)\rho_U(0)$, is essential for deriving Landauer's bound. In fact, we regard the unit (functioning as a memory in this case) as an auxiliary system to which the experimenter has free access. If the memory was initially correlated with the system, it should be treated as part of the system instead [41]. In presence of initial correlations, it is well-known that Landauer's bound does *not* hold [45, 98]. [5]

We end with some remarks. As pointed out in Ref. [17], erasing information is *not* necessarily a thermodynamically irreversible process because when reaching the equality in Eq. (57) we have a thermodynamically *reversible* process (i.e., a process with zero entropy production). The inverse operation of erasure corresponds to a *randomization* of the memory back to its initial state while absorbing heat from the environment. This is not a computational process, i.e., a deterministic operation on the set of logical states. [6] In this sense, a logically irreversible computer is associated with an irretrievable loss of energy and hence, behaves thermodynamically irreversible. In fact, the information-driven engines introduced in Sec. IV C can be seen as an implementation of the reverse process. The duality between work extraction and information erasure was also noticed in Refs. [31, 32, 44, 73, 75, 77–80].

[5] This statement is also true in the classical context and does not require any quantum entanglement.

[6] If randomization would be a computational process, we could build computers that are perfect random number generators, which is obviously not the case.

E. The second law of thermodynamics for discrete feedback control

Feedback control describes setups where one manipulates the dynamics of a system based on the information that one obtains by measuring it. Several groups have established that for a system undergoing feedback control in contact with a thermal reservoir at inverse temperature β, the amount of extractable work $W^{\rm fb}$ is bounded by (details about the assumptions are stated below) [99–111]

$$-\beta W^{\rm fb} \leq I^{\rm ms}_{S:U}, \tag{58}$$

where $I^{\rm ms}_{S:U}$ is the classical mutual information [which can be obtained from Eq. (11) by replacing the von Neumann with Shannon entropies] between the system and the memory in which the measurement result is stored *after* the measurement. Eq. (58) is also called the second law of thermodynamics for discrete feedback control and it was confirmed experimentally in Refs. [112–114].

To be more specific, the inequality (58) holds under special conditions. For instance, the bound is known to be different for quantum systems [104], and even classically, additional requirements are imposed on the measurement which are seldomly stated explicitly. Within our framework, we will show that we are able to provide a very transparent and clean proof of Eq. (58).

The memory used to store the measurement of the system will be a unit in our setup. The assumption of an initially decorrelated system-memory state complies with the notion of a memory used in Sec. IV D. We assume that the Hamiltonian H_U of the memory is completely degenerate so that the change in energy of the memory is always zero, $\Delta E_U = 0$. The stream of memories can thus be viewed as the information reservoir introduced in Sec. IV C. Including changes in the energy of the memory poses no fundamental challenge, but would just lengthen the equations below.

We now divide the interaction interval as $[0,\tau) = [0,t_{\rm ms})\cup[t_{\rm ms},\tau)$ with $t_{\rm ms}\in(0,\tau)$ as illustrated on Fig. 4. The measurement is performed during $[0,t_{\rm ms})$ whereas the feedback step is performed during $[t_{\rm ms},\tau)$. The measurement can thus happen instantaneously ($t_{\rm ms}\to 0$) or in a finite time.

In the instantaneous case there is a sudden unitary operation $U_{\rm ms}$ acting on the system and memory space caused by a delta-function like time dependence of the interaction Hamiltonian $H_{SU}(t) = \delta(t)V^{\rm ms}_{SU}$ during the measurement. The state of the system and memory after the measurement is therefore

$$\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU} = U_{\rm ms}\rho_S(0)\rho_U U^\dagger_{\rm ms}, \tag{59}$$

where $U_{\rm ms} = \exp(-iV^{\rm ms}_{SU})$ and $\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU}$ will be in general correlated. During this short time window the system and memory are effectively decoupled from the reservoir and the measurement acts in an entropy-preserving fashion. As a result during $[0,t_{\rm ms})$, the first and second law respectively read $\Delta E^{\rm ms}_S = W^{\rm ms}$ (work) and

$$\Sigma^{\rm ms} = \Delta S^{\rm ms}_{SU} = \Delta S^{\rm ms}_S + \Delta S^{\rm ms}_U - I^{\rm ms}_{S:U} = 0. \tag{60}$$

The positive mutual information which has been created during the measurement step, $I^{\rm ms}_{S:U}$, will play the role of a resource during the feedback step.

If the measurement time $t_{\rm ms}$ remains finite, we are effectively implementing an "environmentally-assisted measurement". If $\mathcal{L}_{\rm ms}(t)$ denotes the Liouvillian governing the time evolution of the system and memory during $[0,t_{\rm ms})$, then the initial state will be mapped onto [see Eq. (24)]

$$\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU} = \left[\mathcal{T}_+ \exp\int_0^{t_{\rm ms}} ds\mathcal{L}_{\rm ms}(s)\right]\rho_S(0)\rho_U \tag{61}$$

which is again correlated in general. In this case there might be exchanges of heat $Q^{\rm ms}$ with the environment and the first and second law respectively read $\Delta E^{\rm ms}_S = W^{\rm ms} + Q^{\rm ms}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma^{\rm ms} &= \Delta S^{\rm ms}_{SU} - \beta Q^{\rm ms}\\ &= \Delta S^{\rm ms}_S + \Delta S^{\rm ms}_U - I^{\rm ms}_{S:U} - \beta Q^{\rm ms} \geq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

A reversible implementation of the measurement, $\Sigma^{\rm ms}_S = 0$, is still possible in the limit $t_{\rm ms}\to\infty$ as examined explicitly by Bennett and others [16, 72, 82, 83].

We remark that from the system's perspective, the measurement simply changes its state from $\rho_S(0)$ to $\rho^{\rm ms}_S = {\rm tr}_U(\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU}) \equiv \Phi^{\rm ms}_S\rho_S(0)$, where $\Phi^{\rm ms}_S$ denotes the Kraus map of the measurement. So far our approach is very general since it includes any possible measurement scenario (including measurements on classical systems) compatible with an initially decorrelated system-memory state [39, 41].

We now turn to the feedback step. In a macroscopic setting, the observer would make a projective measurement of the memory in the *computational basis* $|r\rangle_U$. After reading out the outcome r of the measurement, she would subsequently perform a feedback step by accordingly changing the system Hamiltonian and/or the system-environment coupling. In an inclusive approach, the macroscopic agent is not necessary and the same dynamics for the system can be obtained by using a total Hamiltonian of the form [7]

$$H_{\rm fb}(t) = \sum_r \Pi_r \otimes \left[H^{(r)}_S(t) + H^{(r)}_{SR}\right] + H_R. \tag{63}$$

Here, $\Pi_r = |r\rangle_U\langle r|$ denotes the projector onto the subspace corresponding to result r. More details on such

[7] To see this, it suffices to note that, first, the unitary time evolution operator associated to $H_{\rm fb}(t)$ is of the form $U_{\rm fb} = \sum_r \Pi_r U^{(r)}_{SR}$ where $U^{(r)}_{SR}$ acts exclusively on the system and reservoir space, and, second, that the reduced state of the system and reservoir is given by tracing over the unit Hilbert space.


time
0
$t_{\rm ms}$
τ
measurement interval
feedback interval
$\rho_S\rho_U$
$\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU} \neq \rho^{\rm ms}_S\rho^{\rm ms}_U$
$\rho^{\rm fb}_{SU} \neq \rho^{\rm fb}_S\rho^{\rm fb}_U$
state
$I = 0$
$I^{\rm ms} > 0$
$I^{\rm ms} > I^{\rm fb} \geq 0$
correlation
$\Delta E^{\rm ms}_S = W^{\rm ms} + Q^{\rm ms}$
$-\Delta E^{\rm ms}_S = W^{\rm fb} + Q^{\rm fb}$
1st law
$\Delta S^{\rm ms}_U + \beta W^{\rm ms}$
$-\Delta F^{\rm ms}_S - I^{\rm ms} \geq 0$
$\Delta S^{\rm fb}_U + \beta W^{\rm fb}$
$+\Delta F^{\rm ms}_S + I^{\rm ms} \geq 0$
2nd law

FIG. 4. Overview of the involved quantities and their changes during the measurement and feedback step. Note that we again used already the steady state assumption for the system here.

a description and a way to extract the maximum work can be found in [104]. More generally, the idea to describe a measured and feedback controlled system in a larger space without having to rely on *explicit* measurements is not new and is at the heart of coherent feedback in quantum mechanics [115–117]. In this setting the unit corresponds to a somewhat minimal description of the external agent or feedback controller. This idea works also classically and is closely related to the bipartite approach of Ref. [118]. The first and second law of thermodynamics during the feedback step take now the form

$$\Delta E^{\rm fb}_S = W^{\rm fb} + Q^{\rm fb}, \tag{64}$$

$$\Sigma^{\rm fb}_S = \Delta S^{\rm fb}_S + \Delta S^{\rm fb}_U - \beta Q^{\rm fb} + I^{\rm ms}_{S:U} \geq I^{\rm fb}_{S:U} \geq 0, \tag{65}$$

where $I^{\rm ms}_{S:U}$ is the initial system-memory mutual information which is given by the final state of the measurement interval $\rho^{\rm ms}_{SU}$, while $I^{\rm fb}_{S:U} \equiv I_{S:U}(\tau)$ is the mutual information remaining at the end of the full interval which will *always diminish* the possible amount of extractable work.

We note that the second law for discrete feedback control (58) gives a bound on the extractable work *during the feedback process* but neglects the work invested during the measurement step (which however can be zero). By using Eq. (65) together with Eq. (64) we obtain

$$-\beta W^{\rm fb} \leq -\beta \Delta E^{\rm fb}_S + \Delta S^{\rm fb}_S + \Delta S^{\rm fb}_U + I^{\rm ms}_{S:U}. \tag{66}$$

Assuming that the system operates at steady state, we get that $\Delta E_S = \Delta E^{\rm ms}_S + \Delta E^{\rm fb}_S = 0$ and $\Delta S_S = \Delta S^{\rm ms}_S + \Delta S^{\rm fb}_S = 0$. Hence, Eq. (66) becomes

$$-\beta W^{\rm fb} \leq \beta \Delta F^{\rm ms}_S + \Delta S^{\rm fb}_U + I^{\rm ms}_{S:U} \tag{67}$$

which can be regarded as the *generalized second law for discrete feedback control*. To reproduce the result (58), we consider the case of a non-disturbing classical measurement in which the state of the system before and after the measurement is the same [41] and the information stored in the memory is classical. The first property gives $\Delta F^{\rm ms}_S = 0$ while the second tells us that, after the measurement, the memory is diagonal in its computational basis $|r\rangle_U$. Therefore, the evolution caused by the Hamiltonian (63) will leave the entropy of the memory constant, $\Delta S^{\rm fb}_U = 0$. Hence, we have derived our desired result (58), but by clearly identifying the necessary additional assumptions. It is worth pointing out that even *classical* measurements can be disturbing [41] and in fact, every measurement in practice will be. Then, in general $\Delta F^{\rm ms}_S \neq 0$ and the amount of extractable work changes.

A summary of the thermodynamics of feedback control within our framework is given in Fig. 4. A model-system application will also be provided in Sec. VI D.

To conclude, we emphasize that our feedback control scheme (implemented by a stream of memories) is equivalent to the information reservoir described in Sec. IV C. This implies for instance that the total extractable work $W = W^{\rm ms} + W^{\rm fb}$ is bounded by ΔS_U, see Eq. (55). This connection between feedback control and information-driven engines was debated in Refs. [79, 119–121] but is unambiguous here.

V. INFINITESIMAL INTERACTION TIMES AND EFFECTIVE MASTER EQUATIONS

The thermodynamic framework introduced in Sec. III is very general. It can be used to study repeated interaction of an arbitrary interval length τ if one is able to solve the dynamics in the joint system-unit space. In this section we are interested in obtaining a reduced description of the system only by considering different limits where the interaction time between the system and the unit becomes very short.

The effective master equations (MEs) that we will consider below often have an apparent *non-thermal* character. For instance they do not obey the condition (25). Establishing a thermodynamic interpretation of such MEs when solely considered as mathematical objects can be challenging and often requires the *ad hoc* introduction of effective new quantities, which lack a solid physical interpretation [122–125]. Progress has been achieved if the ME results from coarse graining a larger network of states which originally obeys a thermodynamically consistent ME, especially if the network is bipartite [118, 126–130], or for particular information-driven engines [79] and "boundary-driven" MEs [131]. Because the repeated interaction framework is formulated for a clear physical setup, we will provide a consistent thermodynamic interpretation to all the MEs we derive.

The definition of the energy and entropy of the system will always be given by

$$E_S(t) = {\rm tr}_S\{H_S(t)\rho_S(t)\}, \tag{68}$$

$$S_S(t) = -{\rm tr}_S\{\rho_S(t)\ln\rho_S(t)\} \tag{69}$$

implying that the system is at most weakly coupled to the large thermal reservoir as in Sec. II C.

In fact, to prepare ourselves for the following subsections, let us assume for the moment that we switch off the additional reservoir kept at inverse temperature β and that the system and unit Hamiltonian $H_{S,U} \sim \mathbf{1}_{S,U}$ are trivial. We further assume that the interaction between system and unit happens instantaneously, i.e., we mathematically require that $\tau' \to 0$ in notation of Sec. III. Formally, if the interaction happens at time t, the time-evolution operator over this period becomes

$$\begin{aligned} U &\equiv \lim_{\tau' \to 0} \mathcal{T}_+ \exp\left[-i \int_t^{t+\tau'} ds H_{SU}(s)\right] \\ &\equiv \exp\left[-i V_{SU}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

and the system and unit state change according to

$$\rho'_{SU}(t) = U \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_U U^\dagger \tag{71}$$

where $\rho'_{SU}(t)$ is the system-unit state shortly after the interaction and ρ_U the initial state of the unit. For later convenience we also introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{J}_S \rho_S(t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}_U\{U \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_U U^\dagger\}, \tag{72}$$

$$\mathcal{J}_U \rho_U \equiv \mathrm{tr}_S\{U \rho_S(t) \otimes \rho_U U^\dagger\}, \tag{73}$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{S/U}$ is a superoperator which characterizes the effect of the interaction on the system/unit. Note that $\mathcal{J}_U = \mathcal{J}_U(t)$ might be time-dependent if $\rho_S(t)$ has not reached its steady state yet.

We now introduce two important concepts. First, the *waiting time distribution* $w(t)$ which characterizes how long we have to wait between two successive system-unit interactions. For instance, for the periodic interactions discussed in Sec. III we had $w(t) = \delta(t - \tau)$. Second, the *conditional density matrix* $\rho_S^{(n)}(t)$ describing the system density matrix conditioned on the fact that n interactions with the units happened so far. Then, $\rho_S^{(n)}(t)$ is related to $\rho_S^{(n-1)}(t')$ at an earlier time $t' \leq t$ by the fact that one interaction must have happened

$$\rho_S^{(n)}(t) = \int_{t_0}^t dt' w(t - t') \mathcal{J}_S \rho_S^{(n-1)}(t'), \tag{74}$$

where $t_0 < t$ is an arbitrary initial time and where the integral is weighted with the waiting time distribution. Finally, the unconditional state of the system is recovered by summing over n: $\rho_S(t) = \sum_n \rho_S^{(n)}(t)$.

In the following subsections we will take a look at different scenarios which allow us to derive effective MEs.

A. Poisson-distributed interaction times

1. Setup

In this subsection we consider an exponential waiting time distribution $w(t) = \gamma e^{-\gamma t}$, which implies that the number N of units with which the system interacts in a fixed time window T is Poisson-distributed, i.e., $P_N(T) = \frac{(\gamma T)^N}{N!} e^{-\gamma T}$. Consequently, the average length of one interval is then $\int_0^\infty t w(t) dt = \gamma^{-1}$.

Furthermore, we assume that the system-unit interactions are very strong though they happen very rarily. In this way we can assure that the units have a finite influence on the evolution of the density matrix. More specifically, if the interactions happen at times t_n ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$), the system-unit interaction Hamiltonian is modeled as a sum of delta kicks

$$H_{SU}(t) = \sum_n \delta(t - t_n) V_{SU}, \tag{75}$$

which is consistent with Eq. (70). A sketch of the scenario is shown in Fig. 5.



FIG. 5. Sketch of the Poisson-distributed interaction intervals: most of the times there is no interaction between the system and the unit, but occasionally there is a sudden ($\tau' \to 0$) and strong ($H_{SU} \sim \tau'^{-1}$) interaction. The lengths of the full intervals are not fixed, but fluctuate according to an exponential time distribution with average length γ^{-1}.

Additionally, we also allow for a large thermal reservoir at inverse temperature β with which the system can interact. In absence of any system-unit interaction, the system then obeys a ME of the form (23)

$$d_t \rho_S(t) = \mathcal{L}_0 \rho_S(t) \equiv -i[H_S(t), \rho_S(t)] + \mathcal{L}_\beta \rho_S(t), \tag{76}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ is the standard dissipator caused by a large Markovian thermal reservoir. This is allowed because by assumption the system-unit interactions are very rare and short compared to any other time evolution. Similar interaction scenarios have been also considered previously for different purposes, for instance in Refs. [28, 79, 119, 132–135]. Note that for notational simplicity the time-dependence of superoperators is implicit, $\mathcal{L}_\beta = \mathcal{L}_\beta(t)$.

Using the exponential waiting time distribution and taking into account that the system evolves during the time without interactions according to Eq. (76), Eq. (74) is readily updated to

$$\rho_S^{(n)}(t) = \int_{t_0}^t dt' \gamma e^{-\gamma(t-t')} e^{\mathcal{L}_0(t-t')} \mathcal{J}_S \rho_S^{(n-1)}(t'). \tag{77}$$

If $\mathcal{L}_0$ is time-dependent, we have to replace $e^{\mathcal{L}_0(t-t')}$ by the corresponding time-ordered generator, see Eq. (24).

By taking the time derivative of $\rho_S^{(n)}(t)$ we arrive at three terms:

$$d_t\rho_S^{(n)}(t) = -\gamma\rho_S^{(n)}(t) + \mathcal{L}_0\rho_S^{(n)}(t) + \gamma\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S^{(n-1)}(t). \quad (78)$$

Summing this equation over n gives finally an effective ME governing the time-evolution of the system:

$$d_t\rho_S(t) = \mathcal{L}_0\rho_S(t) + \gamma(\mathcal{J}_S - 1)\rho_S(t). \quad (79)$$

Similarly, on average, the state of the units over a time step dt changes according to

$$\rho_U(t+dt) = (1-\gamma dt)\rho_U(t) + \gamma dt\mathcal{J}_U\rho_U(t) \quad (80)$$

where γdt (resp. $1-\gamma dt$) is the probability that a unit does (resp. does not) interact with the system to lowest order in dt. This means that the average rate of change of the units can be expressed as

$$d_t\rho_U(t) = \gamma(\mathcal{J}_U - 1)\rho_U(t). \quad (81)$$

We emphasize that this equation is not a differential equation describing the change of a given unit over a finite time interval since the units get constantly replaced after each interaction. Below, ρ_U will therefore always refer to the initial state of the unit.

We can make the new part $\gamma(\mathcal{J}_S - 1)$ of the ME (79) more explicit by writing the initial state of the unit as

$$\rho_U = \sum_k p_k|k\rangle_U\langle k| \quad (82)$$

where $\{|k\rangle_U\}$ is an arbitrary set of eigenstates of ρ_U (not necessarily energy eigenstates of H_U). Then, we see that

$$\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S(t) = \sum_{k,l} A_{kl}\rho_S(t)A_{kl}^\dagger \quad (83)$$

has the form of a Kraus map (4) where the system operators defined as $A_{kl} \equiv \sqrt{p_k}\langle l|U|k\rangle_U$ fulfill the completeness relation $\sum_{k,l} A_{kl}^\dagger A_{kl} = \mathbf{1}_S$. Therefore, we can write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho_S(t) \equiv \gamma(\mathcal{J}_S - 1)\rho_S(t) = \gamma\sum_{k,l}\mathcal{D}[A_{kl}]\rho_S(t)\,, \quad (84)$$

where $\mathcal{D}[A]\rho \equiv A\rho A^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{A^\dagger A, \rho\}$, thus explicitly showing that $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}$ is of Lindblad form [52–54]. Note that within this scenario we can create arbitrary A_{kl} as long as they fulfill the completeness relation. In short, the new ME (79) can be written as

$$d_t\rho_S(t) = -i[H_S(t), \rho_S(t)] + \mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t) + \mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho_S(t). \quad (85)$$

We now turn to the thermodynamic description corresponding to the dynamics (85).

2. Thermodynamics

The rate of work injected in the joint system-unit will again consist of two contributions: $\dot{W} = \dot{W}_S + \dot{W}_{SU}$. The first is the work due to the time-dependence in the system Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$ (which is assumed negligible over the system-unit interaction time τ') and which reads $\dot{W}_S = {\rm tr}_S\{\rho_S(t)d_tH_S(t)\}$. The second is due to the system-unit interaction which occurs seldom with probability $\gamma dt \ll 1$ per interval dt and gives rise to a unitary dynamics in the system-unit space which produces no heat. It is therefore given by the energy change in the system-unit due to the system-unit interactions which reads

$$\begin{aligned}&\dot{W}_{SU}(t) \quad (86)\\ &= \gamma{\rm tr}_{SU}\{(H_S(t)+H_U)[U\rho_S(t)\rho_U U^\dagger - \rho_S(t)\rho_U]\}\\ &= \gamma{\rm tr}_S\{H_S(t)(\mathcal{J}_S-1)\rho_S(t)\} + \gamma{\rm tr}_U\{H_U(\mathcal{J}_U-1)\rho_U\}.\end{aligned}$$

The overall change in the energy of the system and of the units is naturally given by

$$d_tE_S(t) = {\rm tr}_S\{H_S(t)d_t\rho_S(t)\}\,, \quad (87)$$
$$d_tE_U(t) = \gamma{\rm tr}_U\{H_U(\mathcal{J}_U-1)\rho_U\}\,, \quad (88)$$

and the heat entering the system from the reservoir by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{Q}(t) &= {\rm tr}_S\{H_S(t)\mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t)\} \quad (89)\\ &= -\beta^{-1}{\rm tr}_S\left\{[\mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t)]\ln\rho_\beta^S(t)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\dot{W}_{SU}(t) - d_tE_U(t) = \gamma{\rm tr}_S\{H_S(t)\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho_S(t)\}$, we verify that the first law of thermodynamics reads

$$d_tE_S(t) = \dot{Q}(t) + \dot{W}(t) - d_tE_U(t). \quad (90)$$

This result is the differential version of the general result Eq. (43).

We now proceed to show that the differential version of the generalized second law (45),

$$\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) = d_tS_S(t) + d_tS_U(t) - \beta\dot{Q} \geq 0, \quad (91)$$

also holds and that its non-negativity is ensured. Indeed, using the identity $d_tS[\rho(t)] = -{\rm tr}\{d_t\rho(t)\ln\rho(t)\}$ together with (79) and (81) yields

$$\begin{aligned}d_tS_S(t) =& -{\rm tr}_S\{[\mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t)]\ln\rho_S(t)\} \quad (92)\\ &-\gamma{\rm tr}_S\{[(\mathcal{J}_S-1)\rho_S(t)]\ln\rho_S(t)\},\\ d_tS_U(t) =& -\gamma{\rm tr}_U\{[(\mathcal{J}_U-1)\rho_U]\ln\rho_U\}. \quad (93)\end{aligned}$$

Combining these with (89), we can rewrite (91) as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) =& -{\rm tr}_S\left\{\mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t)\left[\ln\rho_S(t) - \ln\rho_\beta^S(t)\right]\right\}\\ &-\gamma{\rm tr}_S\{[(\mathcal{J}_S-1)\rho_S(t)]\ln\rho_S(t)\}\\ &-\gamma{\rm tr}_U\{[(\mathcal{J}_U-1)\rho_U]\ln\rho_U\}. \quad (94)\end{aligned}$$

The second and third term can now be expressed in terms of relative entropies and mutual information as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) =& -{\rm tr}_S\left\{\mathcal{L}_\beta\rho_S(t)\left[\ln\rho_S(t) - \ln\rho_\beta^S(t)\right]\right\}\\ &+\gamma D[\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S(t)||\rho_S(t)] + \gamma D[\mathcal{J}_U\rho_U||\rho_U]\\ &+\gamma I_{S:U}[U\rho_S(t)\rho_U U^\dagger], \quad (95)\end{aligned}$$

where we made use of the chain of equalities

$$\begin{aligned} &S[\rho_S(t)] + S[\rho_U] \\ &= S[\rho_S(t)\otimes\rho_U] = S[U\rho_S(t)\otimes\rho_U U^\dagger] \\ &= S[\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S(t)] + S[\mathcal{J}_U\rho_U] - I_{S:U}[U\rho_S(t)\rho_U U^\dagger]. \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

The positivity of $\dot\Sigma_S(t)$ therefore follows by noting that the first term in (95) is positive by virtue of Spohn's inequality (31) and that the remaining terms are positive because relative entropies and mutual information are positive.

The present analysis underlines that our generalized thermodynamic framework of repeated interaction can be carried over to the limiting situation considered in this section of very short and Poisson-distributed system-unit interactions. The resulting description is closed in terms of the system density matrix obeying the dynamics (85) and the positivity of the differential form of the second law (91) is a stronger result than the original integrated one (44).

A crucial point to emphasize is that knowing the physical mechanism underlying a ME dynamics such as (85) is essential to establish its correct thermodynamics. Indeed, without the additional information about the units at hand, the thermodynamic analysis would be very different. Presupposing that we were able to disentangle the two dissipative mechanisms caused by $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}$, we would need to define an effective heat flow $\dot Q_{\rm eff}(t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}\{H_S\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho_S(t)\}$ to explain the discrepancy in the first law. From our inclusive approach above, however, we know that $\dot Q_{\rm eff}(t) = \dot W_{SU}(t) - d_tE_U(t)$. The effect on the second law would even be more drastic. Using Spohn's inequality (31), we know that the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \dot\Sigma_S^{\rm eff} \equiv &-\mathrm{tr}\{[\mathcal{L}_0\rho_S(t)][\ln\rho_S(t) - \ln\rho_\beta^S(t)]\} \\ &-\mathrm{tr}\{[\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho_S(t)][\ln\rho_S(t) - \ln\bar\rho_{\rm new}]\} \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

would be always positive as a sum of two positive terms. Here, $\bar\rho_{\rm new}$ denotes the steady state of $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}$, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\bar\rho_{\rm new} = 0$. In fact, if $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}$ would correspond to the dissipator caused by a standard thermal reservoir, Eq. (97) would correspond to the standard entropy production. However, this is not the case and thus, $\dot\Sigma_S^{\rm eff}$ is not only numerically different from $\dot\Sigma_S$, but also lacks any a priori thermodynamic interpretation.

3. *Heat, work and information dominated interactions*

We now consider specific classes of system-unit interactions which have a clear thermodynamic interpretation.

We start by studying the conditions under which the stream of units can mimic an ideal heat reservoir. In the spirit of the general approach of Sec. IV A, we assume that the units are initially prepared in a thermal state at inverse temperature β'. Then, using (93) and (88), we directly deduce that

$$d_tS_U(t) = \beta' d_tE_U(t), \tag{98}$$

i.e., Eq. (50) is automatically fulfilled and the units *always* mimic a heat reservoir as long as they are initially thermal. However, an initially thermal unit does not necessarily imply that $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho^S_{\beta'}(t) = 0$. A way to ensure it is to choose the same Hilbert space and Hamiltonian for the units and for the system, $H_S = \sum_k E_k|E_k\rangle_S\langle E_k|$ and $H_U = \sum_k E_k|E_k\rangle_U\langle E_k|$, and to consider a unitary interaction of the form

$$U = \sum_{k,l} |E_k\rangle_S\langle E_l| \otimes |E_l\rangle_U\langle E_k|. \tag{99}$$

This can be checked to be a unitary operator and to fulfill $\mathcal{L}_{\rm new}\rho^S_{\beta'}(t) = 0$.

For the work reservoir, we require $d_tS_U = 0$ while $d_tE_U \neq 0$. To ensure this for an arbitrary initial unit state, we can consider a system-unit interaction which generates a unitary dynamics both in the system and in the unit

$$U = U_S \otimes U_U \quad \text{(ideal work reservoir)}, \tag{100}$$

In this case correlations do not build up and $I_{S:U} = 0$ as can be easily seen using (96).

In turn, the limit of an information reservoir where $d_tE_U = 0$ and $d_tS_U(t) \neq 0$ can be easily achieved for any interaction by considering a fully degenerate unit Hamiltonian,

$$H_U \sim \mathbf{1}_U \quad \text{(ideal information reservoir)} \tag{101}$$

naturally always implying $d_tE_U = 0$.

A last important class of interactions are those generated by the unitary operator

$$U = \sum_k U_S^{(k)} \otimes |k\rangle_U\langle k|\,, \tag{102}$$

where $U_S^{(k)}$ is an arbitrary unitary operator in the system Hilbert space whereas $|k\rangle_U$ denotes the eigenvectors of ρ_U (82). One easily verifies that the unit state does not change during the interaction, $\rho_U = \mathcal{J}_U\rho_U$, and hence its energy and entropy also stays constant, $d_tE_U = 0, d_tS_U = 0$. In this case, the units are neither a work nor an information reservoir. Instead, the system state changes according to

$$\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S = \sum_k p_k U_S^{(k)}\rho_S(U_S^{(k)})^\dagger, \tag{103}$$

where $p_k = \langle k|\rho_U|k\rangle$. This interaction will therefore in general inject energy as well as entropy into the system. Using (96), we see that the change in the system entropy caused by such a system-unit interaction is given by the mutual information established between the system and the unit after the interaction

$$S[\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S(t)] - S[\rho_S(t)] = I_{S:U}[U\rho_S(t)\rho_U U^\dagger]. \tag{104}$$

Thus, the interaction (102) can be seen as a measurement of the unit by the system. Indeed, depending on the unit

state $|k\rangle_U$, the system will in general change its state to $U_S^{(k)}\rho_S(U_S^{(k)})^\dagger$. Vice versa, by exchanging the labels U and S above, we can also implement a measurement of the system by the units. This will be used in Sec. VI D.

B. Regular and frequent interaction intervals

1. Setup

There is another subclass of interactions which have been considered previously [131, 134, 136–138], also from a thermodynamic perspective [131, 137, 138]. For this case we assume regular but short interaction intervals such that the waiting time distribution is given by $w(t) = \delta(t-\delta t)$ where δt will now play the role of a small expansion parameter. Now, however, an interaction Hamiltonian of the form (75) is too strong in the sense that the resulting system dynamics could not be described by a differential equation for $\delta t \to 0$. We therefore assume that the interaction Hamiltonian scales such that (70) can be written as $U = \exp(-iV_{SU}) = \exp(-i\sqrt{\delta t}\tilde{V})$. Furthermore, the system is allowed to freely evolve according to its Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$ assuming that its time-dependence is slow compared to δt. In contrast to the previous section, we now explicitly neglect any additional reservoir. Indeed, a continuous coupling to a reservoir *and* a permanent interaction with the units of the form $V_{SU} = \sqrt{\delta t}\tilde{V}$ is hard to treat without additional assumptions.

After all the assumptions above, we are allowed to modify Eq. (74) to

$$\rho_S^{(n)}(t+\delta t) = e^{-iH_S(t)\delta t}\left[\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S^{(n-1)}(t)\right]e^{iH_S(t)\delta t}. \quad (105)$$

Note that this equation is true to lowest order in δt even if $H_S(t)$ and $\tilde{V}$ *do not commute*. Furthermore, we will simply forget about the index n in the following because there is no randomness in the interaction times, i.e., n and t are directly proportional.

Then, expanding $U\rho_S(t)\rho_U U^\dagger$ in powers of V yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_S\rho_S(t) = \rho_S(t) &- i\sqrt{\delta t}\mathrm{tr}_U\left\{[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]\right\} \\ &- \frac{\delta t}{2}\mathrm{tr}_U\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\} + \dots\end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

In order to derive a senseful differential equation we now additionally demand that the interaction $\tilde{V}$ or the initial unit state ρ_U is chosen such that $\mathrm{tr}_U\{\tilde{V}\rho_U\} = 0$, which removes the term proportional to $\sqrt{\delta t}$. Then, expanding the exponentials in Eq. (105) yields after a short manipulation the effective ME

$$\begin{aligned}d_t\rho_S(t) &\equiv \lim_{\delta t\to 0}\frac{\rho_S(t+\delta t)-\rho_S(t)}{\delta t} \\ &= -i[H_S(t),\rho_S(t)] - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_U\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\}.\end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Again, we can make this effective ME a little more explicit by writing $\tilde{V} = \sum_k A_k \otimes B_k$ where the set A_k and B_k are arbitrary operators in the system and unit space such that $\tilde{V}$ is hermitian. Then, after a short manipulation we arrive at our final ME

$$\begin{aligned}d_t\rho_S(t) = &-i[H_S(t),\rho_S(t)] \\ &+ \sum_{k,l}\langle B_l B_k\rangle_U\left(A_k\rho_S(t)A_l - \frac{1}{2}\{A_lA_k,\rho_S(t)\}\right).\end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

This result agrees with Refs. [131, 134, 136–138] and will be further used in Sec. VI C. It is also worth to remark that – although coupling to a permanent macroscopic reservoir might be challenging – additional reservoirs can be simulated by additional streams of units as done in Ref. [131, 136].

Finally, we note that the ME (108) can be also derived as a limiting case of Sec. V A showing that the Poisson case is indeed more general. For this purpose we scale the Poisson rate as $\gamma = \delta t^{-1}$ reflecting the fact that the units interact with the system very frequently. Then, by neglecting $\mathcal{L}_\beta$ in Eq. (85) and by expanding the unitary interaction operator U in $\mathcal{J}_S$ as above, we can easily reproduce Eq. (108) (not shown).

2. Thermodynamics

A thorough thermodynamic analysis of such "boundary driven MEs" (108) was given in Ref. [131] for the case of initially thermal units $\rho_U = \rho_\beta^U$. We will now rederive this analysis by using the fact just mentioned (i.e., that the ME can be derived from the Poisson treatment for a perturbative expansion in δt with $\gamma = \delta t^{-1}$ and $V_{SU} = \sqrt{\delta t}\tilde{V}$). Because we are approaching this problem from a different perspective, we thereby provide an important crosscheck for our framework as well as the claims made in Ref. [131].

For $\mathrm{tr}_U\{\tilde{V}\rho_U\} = 0$ it follows immediately that (in the following we neglect all terms of order higher than δt)

$$\gamma(\mathcal{J}_S - 1)\rho_S(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_U\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\}, \quad (109)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(\mathcal{J}_U - 1)\rho_U = &-i\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\mathrm{tr}_S\left\{[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]\right\} \\ &-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_S\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\}.\end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Thus, it is clear that all thermodynamic quantities defined in Sec. V A for the system (i.e., $d_tE_S(t)$ and $d_tS_S(t)$) are well-behaved (i.e., do not diverge for $\delta t \to 0$), but for the unit this is less clear. We start by looking at the entropy. Here, we have

$$\begin{aligned}d_tS_U(t) &= i\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]\ln\rho_U\right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\ln\rho_U\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{[\tilde{V},[\tilde{V},\rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\ln\rho_U\right\}.\end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

For this we used that $\mathrm{tr}\{[A,B]C\} = \mathrm{tr}\{A[B,C]\}$ for any operators A, B, C and $[\rho_S(t)\rho_U, \ln\rho_U] = 0$. Thus, the unit entropy is well behaved and the second law (91) carries over to our situation reading

$$\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) = d_t S_S(t) + d_t S_U(t) \geq 0. \tag{112}$$

However, *in general* the situation is different for $d_t E_U(t)$ and $\dot{W}_{SU}(t)$. For instance (the same terms appear in $\dot{W}_{SU}(t)$, too),

$$\begin{aligned} dE_U(t) = &-i\frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta t}}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{H_U[\tilde{V}, \rho_S(t)\rho_U]\right\} \\ &-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{H_U[\tilde{V}, [\tilde{V}, \rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and the first term will diverge as $\delta t \to 0$ unless $[H_U, \tilde{V}] = 0$ or $[H_U, \rho_U] = 0$. Note, however, that the divergences cancel out if we consider the first law (90) for the system. Furthermore, within the framework of Ref. [131] we indeed have $[H_U, \rho_U] = 0$ since $\rho_U = \rho_\beta^U$ and hence,

$$dE_U(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{H_U[\tilde{V}, [\tilde{V}, \rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\}, \tag{113}$$

$$\dot{W}_{SU}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}_{SU}\left\{(H_S + H_U)[\tilde{V}, [\tilde{V}, \rho_S(t)\rho_U]]\right\}, \tag{114}$$

and everything remains well-behaved. In fact, we can even confirm that $d_t S_U(t) = \beta d_t E_U(t)$ [also see Eq. (98)] and thus, the situation considered here falls into the class of a heat reservoir according to Eq. (50). Furthermore, we can identify $\dot{W}_{SU}(t) = \dot{W}_{\mathrm{sw}}(t)$ by using definition (41) and some algebraic manipulations.

Then, identifying the heat flux from the units into the system as minus the energy change of the units, $\dot{Q}_U = -d_t E_U(t)$, we can rephrase the first and second law as

$$d_t E_S(t) = \dot{W}_{\mathrm{sw}}(t) + \dot{Q}_U(t), \tag{115}$$

$$\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) = d_t S_S(t) - \beta\dot{Q}_U(t) \geq 0. \tag{116}$$

This is in complete agreement with Ref. [131].

Finally, this example also illustrates that – although the dynamics in the joint space of system and all units is unitary (and thus reversible) – the dynamics of the system is irreversible precisely because we impose a unidirectional movement of the units. This can be also seen in the system-specific entropy production, which can be rewritten as [see also Eq. (9)] $\dot{\Sigma}_S(t) = d_t I_{S:U}(t)$, i.e., for the entropy production rate of system and unit [compare with Eq. (44)] we have $\dot{\Sigma} = 0$.

C. Mimicking time-dependent Hamiltonians

1. Setup

In the last part of this section we want to show that the stream of units can be engineered in a way that will effectively generate a time-dependent system Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_S(t) = H_0 + f(t)A. \tag{117}$$

Here, $f(t)$ is an arbitrary real-valued and differentiable function and A an arbitrary hermitian system operator. Below we will then show that this stream of units acts as a work source thereby providing an alternative justification for treating time-dependent Hamiltonians as responsible for work sources as done in standard quantum thermodynamics [6, 8, 51].

As in the previous section we choose a waiting time distribution $w(t) = \delta(t - \delta t)$ and we assume that $f(t)$ changes only infinitesimally during a time-step δt. The idea is then that the interaction with the stream of units approximates $f(t)$ where we now choose $U = e^{-i\delta t A\otimes F}$ where F is a so far unspecified hermitian unit operator. However, if we want to implement an arbitrary drive $f(t)$ it is clear that we must relax the assumption that the units are prepared in the same initial state. Thus, only in this subsection we allow that $\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t) \neq \rho_{U_m}(m\delta t)$ for $n \neq m$ (we set the initial time to be zero such that $\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)$ denotes the initial state of the unit just before the interaction), but the incoming units are still assumed to be decorrelated. Then, Eq. (105) is readily adapted to

$$\rho_S(n\delta t + \delta t) = e^{-iH_0\delta t}\left[\mathcal{J}_S^{(n)}\rho_S(n\delta t)\right]e^{iH_0\delta t}. \tag{118}$$

Again, this equation is true to lowest order in δt even if H_0 and A do not commute. Furthermore, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_S^{(n)}\odot = \mathrm{tr}_U\{e^{-i\delta t AF}\odot\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)e^{i\delta t AF}\}, \tag{119}$$

where it is now important to keep track of the index n.

Then, by expanding Eq. (118) to first order in δt we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S(n\delta t + \delta t) = &\rho_S(n\delta t) \\ &-i\delta t[H_0 + \langle F\rangle_{U_n}(n\delta t)A, \rho_S(n\delta t)]. \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

Clearly, the idea is now to choose the state of the unit such that

$$\langle F\rangle_{U_n}(n\delta t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{F\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)\} = f(n\delta t). \tag{121}$$

Under these circumstances we obtain from Eq. (120) after rearranging the terms in the limit $\delta t \to 0$

$$d_t\rho_S(t) = -i[H_0 + f(t)A, \rho_S(t)], \tag{122}$$

which is the desired evolution according to the Hamiltonian (117).

In fact, as long as δt is choosen to be small enough compared to all relevant time-scales we can even include an additional reservoir in the description such that the Hamiltonian we want to simulate becomes

$$H_{SR}(t) = H_0 + f(t)A + V_{SR} + H_R \tag{123}$$

and the joint system-reservoir state evolves according to

$$d_t\rho_{SR}(t) = -i[H_{SR}(t), \rho_{SR}(t)]. \tag{124}$$

2. Thermodynamics

In order to classify the units thermodynamically, we have to find out how they change over time. The equivalent to Eq. (118) for the units becomes

$$\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)=e^{-iH_U\delta t}\left[\mathcal{J}_U^{(n)}\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)\right]e^{iH_U\delta t} \tag{125}$$

with $\mathcal{J}_U^{(n)}\odot=\mathrm{tr}_S\{e^{-i\delta tAF}\rho_S(n\delta t)\odot e^{i\delta tAF}\}$. Thus, the unit state changes infinitesimally and unitarily according to

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)=\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)\\ -i\delta t[H_U+\langle A\rangle_S(n\delta t)F,\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)].\end{aligned} \tag{126}$$

This implies that the entropy change of the units is zero, $d_tS_{U_n}(t)=0$, and hence, according to the classification schemes from Sec. IV, the stream of units can at most act like a work reservoir.

Next, we look at the energetic balances. First, the change in unit energy is given by

$$\begin{aligned}d_tE_{U_n}&=\delta t^{-1}\mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{H_U[\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)-\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)]\}\\&=i\langle A\rangle_S^n\mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{[F,H_U]\rho_{U_n}^n\}.\end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

For the last line we used Eq. (126). Second, we need to consider the switching work steming from the time-dependent coupling of the system and unit. Here, however, we have to take into account that the *units change* for each interval, i.e., naively applying the definition (41) for W_{sw}, which requires to consider only a single unit, will yield a wrong result. Because we look at the change of thermodynamic quantities from $n\delta t$ over a period δt, we consider

$$\begin{aligned}\delta t\dot{W}_{\mathrm{sw}}=\mathrm{tr}_{SU_{n+1}}\left\{AF\rho_S(n\delta t+\delta t)\rho_{U_{n+1}}(n\delta t+\delta t)\right\}\\ -\mathrm{tr}_{SU_n}\left\{AF\rho_{SU_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

This quantity correctly takes into account the work required to switch on the interaction for the next unit state $\rho_{U_{n+1}}(n\delta t+\delta t)$ minus the work required to switch off the interaction for the actual unit state $\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)$ at the end of the interval. To compute this quantity we look at the change of states including an external reservoir. In particular we need Eq. (126) and

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{SU_n}(n\delta t+\delta t)&=\rho_S(n\delta t)\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)\\&\quad-i\delta t[H_S+H_U+AF,\rho_S(n\delta t)\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)]\\&\quad-i\delta t\mathrm{tr}_R\{[V_{SR},\rho_{SR}(n\delta t)]\}\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t),\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_S(n\delta t+\delta t)&=\rho_S(n\delta t)\\&\quad-i\delta t[H_S+f(n\delta t)A,\rho_S(n\delta t)]\\&\quad-i\delta t\mathrm{tr}_R\{[V_{SR},\rho_{SR}(n\delta t)]\},\end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

which follow from the Liouville-von Neumann equation for a time step δt. Then, after a straightforward but tedious calculation we arrive at (to first order in δt)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{W}_{\mathrm{sw}}&=f'(n\delta t)\langle A\rangle_S(n\delta t)\\&\quad+i\langle A\rangle_S(n\delta t)\mathrm{tr}_{U_n}\{[F,H_U]\rho_{U_n}(n\delta t)\}.\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

Here, we introduced the discretized derivative of $f(t)$ as

$$f'(n\delta t)\equiv\frac{f(n\delta t+\delta t)-f(n\delta t)}{\delta t}, \tag{132}$$

which is well-behaved because we assumed $f(t)$ to be differentiable. Since the units act as a pure work reservoir, we now define the total rate of work done on the system as

$$\dot{W}\equiv\dot{W}_{\mathrm{sw}}-d_tE_{U_n}=f'(n\delta t)\langle A\rangle_S(n\delta t). \tag{133}$$

Finally, let us compare this result with our general treatment from Sec. II A where we found out that for a time dependent Hamiltonian of the form (123) the rate of work done on the system is [compare with Eq. (6)]

$$\dot{W}(t)=\mathrm{tr}_{SR}\{\rho_{SR}(t)d_tH_{\mathrm{tot}}(t)\}=\frac{df(t)}{dt}\mathrm{tr}_S\{A\rho_S(t)\}. \tag{134}$$

This expression exactly coincides for $t=n\delta t$ with Eq. (133). This shows that there is a clean (but somewhat artificial) way to simulate a driven system by a stream of units and to justify that the driving corresponds to pure work, as we also did in Sec. II.

VI. APPLICATIONS

In this section we demonstrate the use of the repeated interaction framework that we have developed in the previous sections by considering specific examples. We mostly emphasize the way in which the setups can be analyzed from our thermodynamic perspective and refer to the original literature for more details. Many more setups such as the squeezed reservoirs in Ref. [25] or the entangled unit states in Ref. [22][8] can be analyzed within our framework, but will not be considered here for brevity.

A. The Mandal-Jarzynski engine

We start by providing a microscopic model describing the information-driven engine first proposed by Mandal and Jarzynski [31] and show that it falls within the class of *information reservoirs* considered in Sec. IV C.

The system is modeled as a three-level system with Hamiltonian

$$H_S=\epsilon_S(|A\rangle\langle A|+|B\rangle\langle B|+|C\rangle\langle C|) \tag{135}$$

and the unit by a two-level system ("bit") with Hamiltonian

$$H_U=\epsilon_U(|0\rangle\langle 0|+|1\rangle\langle 1|). \tag{136}$$

[8] In this case each unit in our setup would actually correspond to two subunits which are both pairwise entangled with eachother, but interact with the system sequentially.

Thus, the bare system and unit Hamiltonians are completely degenerate. The system-unit interaction is switched on and off at the beginning and end of the full interval of length τ, such that the time interval between the unit interactions is infinitely short (i.e., $\tau' \to \tau$). During the interaction, the degeneracy of the system and unit states is lifted via

$$V_{SU} = \frac{\Delta w}{\epsilon_S} H_S |1\rangle\langle 1| \,, \tag{137}$$

such that during the interaction the energy of the system-unit states $|A1\rangle$, $|B1\rangle$, $|C1\rangle$ is $\epsilon_S + \epsilon_U + \Delta w$, and the energy of the system-unit states $|A0\rangle$, $|B0\rangle$, $|C0\rangle$ is $\epsilon_S + \epsilon_U$.

The model is completed by adding a weakly coupled reservoir and by assuming that it induces thermally activated transitions between the following levels: $A0 \leftrightarrow B0$, $B0 \leftrightarrow C0$, $C0 \leftrightarrow A1$, $A1 \leftrightarrow B1$ and $B1 \leftrightarrow C1$. For possible physical setups see Refs. [77, 79].

Note that, although we have written down the model in a quantum mechanical way, the model in Ref. [31] is purely classical. In this spirit we neglect any subtleties arising from deriving a ME for degenerate quantum systems and use a classical rate equation where those levels are connected that interact with the reservoir as specified above. Then, the ME takes on the form $d_t \mathbf{p}(t) = \mathcal{R}\mathbf{p}$ with (in suitable units) [31]

$$\mathbf{p}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} p_{A0}(t) \\ p_{B0}(t) \\ p_{C0}(t) \\ p_{A1}(t) \\ p_{B1}(t) \\ p_{C1}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{138}$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2+\epsilon & 1+\epsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1-\epsilon & -2-\epsilon & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{139}$$

The parameter $\epsilon \in (-1, 1)$ is related to Δw by local detailed balance [see Eq. (26)] via $-\beta \Delta w = \ln \frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}$. The initial state of the incoming units is given by $\rho_U(0) = \frac{1+\delta}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1-\delta}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1|$ with $\delta \in [-1, 1]$. The stationary solution for the system is obtained by solving this rate equation for a time τ with an initial condition $\rho_U(0)$ for the units and $\rho_S(0) = \rho_S(\tau)$ for the system. As demonstrated in Ref. [31], it can be solved exactly.

Our thermodynamic analysis from Sec. III now tells us immediately that $\Delta E_S = 0$ and $\Delta E_U = 0$ due to the degeneracy of the bare system and unit Hamiltonian. Since $\Delta E_U = 0$ it also follows from Eq. (54) that the stream of bits constitutes an information reservoir unless $\Delta S_U = 0$, too. Furthermore, because we have no explicit driving, we also have $W_X = 0$ [see Eq. (40)], and when the system has reached its steady state, we will also have $\Delta S_S = 0$. The first law (43) then tells us that

$$Q = -W_{\rm sw}. \tag{140}$$

In fact, Mandal and Jarzynski imagined a little load attached to the system such that the heat absorbed from the system can be identified as work. Within our setup we indeed see that this "attaching of the load", i.e., the switching on and off of the system-unit interaction, is responsible for providing that energy and has a clear interpretation in our framework. From Eq. (41) we can immediately compute

$$W_{\rm sw} = -\Delta w (\langle 1|\rho_U(\tau)|1\rangle - \langle 1|\rho_U(0)|1\rangle) \,. \tag{141}$$

This term exactly equals (minus) the work identified in Ref. [31]. Finally, in accordance with our second law (55) it was also shown in [31] that

$$Q = -W_{\rm sw} \leq \Delta S_U. \tag{142}$$

B. The micromaser

The micromaser is historically, experimentally, and theoretically important and its operation is based on repeated interactions. Beyond quantum optics it has also been used, e.g., as a model system for transport in superconducting single-electron transistors coupled to quantum resonators [139], where it displays an intriguing dynamics such as self-sustained oscillations and transitions to multistable behaviour. We now briefly elaborate on the fact that in its simplest version, the micromaser can be viewed as a system interacting with a stream of units which operate as a *work reservoir*. Our approach will be qualitative since the detailed calculations can be found, e.g., in Refs. [28, 29, 133].

The system S in this case consists of a high quality cavity supporting a microwave field with Hamiltonian $H_S = \Omega a^\dagger a$ where $a^\dagger$ and a are bosonic creation and annihilation operators and Ω denotes the frequency of the cavity. The microwave mode is coupled to an external environment of electromagnetic field modes at equilibrium with temperature β^{-1} (usually very low) and "high quality" means that the coupling is very weak, especially such that it is negligible on timescales when the system interacts with an atom flying through the cavity. This atom corresponds to a unit U and can be conveniently modeled as a two-level system (TLS) $H_U = \frac{\Delta}{2}(|1\rangle\langle 1| - |0\rangle\langle 0|)$ with energy gap $\Delta \approx \Omega$ (on resonance with the cavity). Depending on the experimental details the units can be prepared in different states and might arrive at the cavity at regular intervals or Poisson distributed, see Fig. 6 for a sketch of the setup and Ref. [30] for a recent experiment even involving measurement and feedback.

In the standard setup the TLSs are prepared in a statistical mixture of excited and ground states and interact with the cavity during a short time (compared to the cavity lifetime) via a Jaynes-Cummings interaction Hamiltonian $V_{SU} = g(|0\rangle\langle 1|a^\dagger + |1\rangle\langle 0|a)$ causing the atom to emit or absorb photons [29]. By tuning the interaction time (or the interaction strength g respectively) correctly, one can make sure that an atom initially in the excited



FIG. 6. Sketch of a micromaser setup. The units are produced in an atomic beam oven and are initialized with a velocity selector and laser excitation. They then interact with a microwave ("maser") cavity (the system) before they are finally detected and their state is read out. Figure taken from Ref. [140] reporting on experimental observation of sub-Poissonian photon statistics in a micromaser.

(ground) state will always emit (absorb) a cavity photon. In essence, the effect of the cavity is therefore to swap the population of the TLSs.

This implies a difference in energy between incoming and outgoing TLSs ($\Delta E_U \neq 0$), but not in entropy because entropy is invariant under exchange of state labels ($\Delta S_U = 0$). Hence, the stream of atoms acts as a pure source of work which builds up a photon field inside the cavity. However, because the cavity is weakly coupled to an outside thermal environment, it constantly looses photons, too. To achieve a steady state occupation of the cavity *above* the thermal average, the incoming TLSs must be in a population-inverted state, i.e., have a higher probability to be excited then in the ground state. More details, such as the exact threshold condition for a buildup of the cavity field, are given in Refs. [28, 29, 133].

C. Lasing without inversion and extracting work from quantum coherence

As explained in the previous section, the thermodynamic working principle (but not the physical origin) of the micromaser can be understood within classical physics. However, it is also possible to populate a cavity above its thermal distribution by using a stream of atoms (units) *without* population inversion. This phenomenon is known as lasing without inversion [29] and results from a destructive interference of the photon absorption process due to a coherent superposition of the energy levels of the incoming unit. Thus, lasing without inversion is a pure quantum effect.

The idea to use quantum coherence via lasing without inversion in order to extract more work from a heat engine than classically possible was proposed by Scully *et al.* in Ref. [21], see also Refs. [141, 142] for similar models and Ref. [143] for a resource theory formulation of the problem. We now briefly sketch how to treat lasing without inversion [29] and how to rederive the results from Ref. [21], from our results of Sec. V B.

The system we are considering is the same as for the micromaser (i.e., a single cavity with frequency Ω). The units are three-level systems described by

$$H_U = E_a|a\rangle\langle a| + E_b|b\rangle\langle b| + E_c|c\rangle\langle c|. \tag{143}$$

We assume a so-called "Λ-configuration" [29] where the two states $|b\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$ are nearly degenerate ($E_b \approx E_c$) and well separated from the excited state $|a\rangle$, which is nearly resonant with the cavity (i.e., $\Omega \approx E_a - E_b \approx E_a - E_c$). The initial state of the units is modeled as a statistical mixture between the energy eigenstates with an additional coherence allowed between the near-degenerate levels $|b\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$. Following the notation of Ref. [21], we use

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_U = {} & P_a|a\rangle\langle a| + P_b|b\rangle\langle b| + P_c|c\rangle\langle c| \\ & + \rho_{bc}|b\rangle\langle c| + \rho_{cb}|c\rangle\langle b|\,,\end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

with $P_a + P_b + P_c = 1$, $P_{a,b,c} \geq 0$ and $\rho_{bc} = \rho_{cb}^* \in \mathbb{C}$. Beyond that, the positive-definiteness of ρ_U requires $\rho_{bc}\rho_{cb} \leq P_b P_c$. Finally, the interaction between system and unit is modeled by a generalized Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{V} = -g\left[a(|a\rangle\langle b| + |a\rangle\langle c|) + a^\dagger(|b\rangle\langle a| + |c\rangle\langle a|)\right]\,, \tag{145}$$

where we assumed that the direct transition between $|b\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$ is dipole-forbidden [29] and assumed an interaction scenario as in Sec. V B 1. We note that in the interaction picture with respect to $H_S + H_U$ we have

$$\tilde{V}_{\text{int}}(t) \equiv e^{i(H_S+H_U)t} V_{SU} e^{-i(H_S+H_U)t} \approx \tilde{V} \tag{146}$$

due to the resonance condition.

We now assume a cavity of very high quality neglecting any dissipation due to the electromagnetic environment such that the system interacts with many atoms coherently. This corresponds to the stage $1 \to 2$ in Fig. 2 of Ref. [21]. Using Eq. (144), it is easy to confirm that $\text{tr}_U\{\tilde{V}\rho_U\} = 0$. Then, following Sec. V B we see that Eq. (108) requires us to compute sixteen correlations functions $\langle B_l B_k\rangle_U$ where we identify $B_1 \equiv -g|a\rangle\langle b|$, $B_2 \equiv -g|a\rangle\langle c|$, $B_3 \equiv -g|b\rangle\langle a|$ and $B_4 \equiv -g|c\rangle\langle a|$. Only six are non-zero and the ME (108) in the interaction picture becomes

$$\begin{aligned}&d_t\rho_S(t) = \\ &\gamma_{\text{eff}}\left\{2P_a\mathcal{D}[a^\dagger] + (P_b + P_c + \rho_{bc} + \rho_{cb})\mathcal{D}[a]\right\}\rho_S(t)\end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

with the dissipator $\mathcal{D}$ defined below Eq. (84) and some effective and for our purposes unimportant rate $\gamma_{\text{eff}} > 0$. The Lindblad form is ensured by the positivity of the unit density matrix which implies $(P_b + P_c + \rho_{bc} + \rho_{cb}) \geq 0$. Note that $\mathcal{D}[a^\dagger]$ describes the absorption and $\mathcal{D}[a]$ the emission of a cavity photon.

If the unit is initially in a thermal state with occupations $P_a = e^{-\beta\Omega/2}/Z$ and $P_b = P_c = e^{\beta\Omega/2}/Z$ and without coherences, $\rho_{bc} = \rho_{cb} = 0$, the rates for emission and

absorption satisfy local detailed balance and the equilibrium state ρ_β^S is the steady state of the ME.

In contrast, with coherences $\rho_{bc}+\rho_{cb} = 2\Re(\rho_{bc})$ (which can be positive as well as negative) the rate of absorption can be decreased or increased. If $2\Re(\rho_{bc}) < 0$, the rate of photon absorption by the units is lowered and lasing without inversion becomes possible. Note that, typically, such coherences in three-level lambda systems are created by two coherent light fields via stimulated Raman processes, i.e., time-dependent external lasers which thus ultimately provide a resource of energy.

To show the equivalence of these results with those of Ref. [21], we compute the evolution of the mean photon occupation of the cavity $N(t) \equiv \mathrm{tr}_S\{a^\dagger a \rho_S(t)\}$. Using $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ and the property $\mathrm{tr}\{ABC\} = \mathrm{tr}\{CAB\}$, we obtain

$$d_t N(t) = \gamma_{\text{eff}} \left\{2P_a[1 + N(t)] - (P_b + P_c + \rho_{bc} + \rho_{cb})N(t)\right\}, \tag{148}$$

which is identical to Eq. (5) in Ref. [21] (after replacing $N(t)$ with n_ϕ and γ_{eff} with α) from which the results in Ref. [21] are derived. The steady state occupation reads

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\text{eff}} \equiv \lim_{t\to\infty} N(t) &= \frac{2P_a}{P_b + P_c - 2P_a + 2\Re(\rho_{bc})} \\ &= \left(e^{\beta\Omega} - 1 + e^{\beta\Omega/2} Z \Re(\rho_{bc})\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{149}$$

For zero coherence it corresponds to the (equilibrium) Bose distribution. But for finite coherence, the cavity population can be lowered or raised. This means that the non-equilibrium free energy of the incoming atoms has been converted into a non-equilibrium free energy for the cavity. This feature alone does not yet yield a positive work output, but a thermodynamic cycle which does so is presented in Ref. [21]. It basically relies on the fact that the population $N(t)$ of the cavity is related to a radiation pressure P via $P \sim N(t)$, which can be used to drive a piston. Then, by putting the cavity first in contact with the stream of atoms populating it according to some effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} > T$ [which can be inferred from Eq. (149)] and afterwards with a standard heat reservoir at temperature T, we can extract work proportional to $N_{T_{\text{eff}}} - N_T$ where N_T denotes the Bose distribution.

The idea behind lasing without inversion thus provides an example of how our framework can account for coherences. Following Ref. [21], we have shown that these latter can be used as a thermodynamic resource. During the first part of the cycle as described above, the units do not correspond to any limiting classification scheme introduced in Sec. IV because the initial state of the units is not thermal and in general the energy as well as the entropy of the units will change, whereas during the rest of the cycle (where the systems expands back to an equilibrium distribution) there are no units interacting with the system.

D. Electronic Maxwell demon

In the traditional thought-experiment of Maxwell, the demon shuffles gas particles from a cold to a hot reservoir with negligible consumption of energy [18, 19]. In an isothermal setup, a similar violation of the traditional second law appears if a feedback mechanism shuffles particles from a reservoir with low chemical potential to a reservoir with high chemical potential. This is the central idea of the electronic Maxwell demon, which has been theoretically well studied for a number of different models [79, 122, 127, 144–149]. The setup proposed in Ref. [127] was recently experimentally realized in Ref. [150]. Below, we revisit one particular electronic Maxwell demon.

The system to be controlled is a conventional single-electron transistor (SET), which consists of a single-level quantum dot connected to two thermal reservoirs with chemical potential μ_ν ($\nu \in \{L, R\}$) at the same inverse temperature β. The quantum dot can either be filled with an electron of energy ϵ_S or empty (corresponding to a zero energy state). A sketch of the setup (with the feedback mechanism described below) is shown in Fig. 7. The ME governing the time evolution of the system in absence of feedback is

$$d_t \rho_S(t) = \sum_\nu \mathcal{L}_\beta^{(\nu)}(\Gamma_\nu)\rho_S(t), \tag{150}$$

where the thermal generators are defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta^{(\nu)}(\Gamma_\nu) \equiv \Gamma_\nu \left\{(1 - f_\nu)\mathcal{D}[|E\rangle_S\langle F|] + f_\nu \mathcal{D}[|F\rangle_S\langle E|]\right\}. \tag{151}$$

Here, $f_\nu = (e^{\beta(\epsilon_S - \mu_\nu)} + 1)^{-1}$ is the Fermi function evaluated at the energy of the quantum dot, and $\Gamma_\nu \geq 0$ is a bare rate which depends on the details of the microscopic coupling Hamiltonian. Furthermore, $|E\rangle_S$ ($|F\rangle_S$) denotes the empty (filled) state of the dot and the dissipator $\mathcal{D}$ is defined in the same way as below Eq. (84).

We now would like to engineer a demon mechanism operating a feedback control on the system which modulates the energy barriers of the dot (i.e., the bare rates Γ_ν) depending on the dot state as sketched in Fig. 7. The phenomenological description of this mechanism was done in Ref. [145] and its thermodynamical analysis was performed in Ref. [122]. A physical mechanism autonomously implementing this feedback was proposed Ref. [127]. It relies on a capacitive coupling to another single level quantum dot at a different temperature. This mechanism was further analyzed in Refs. [118, 149] and will be also used below for comparison. We now propose a different mechanism implementing the same feedback on the system. As sketched in Fig. 7, this one is based on repeated interactions with a stream of units consisting of two-level systems prepared in the state $\rho_U = (1-\epsilon)\Pi_0 + \epsilon\Pi_1$, where $\Pi_i = |i\rangle_U\langle i|$ is the projector on the state $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ is a free parameter quantifying the measurement error.



FIG. 7. (Color Online) Sketch of the electronic Maxwell demon. The system consists of a single-level quantum dot tunnel-coupled to two electronic reservoirs with chemical potentials $\mu_L \geq \mu_R$ and inverse temperature β. The demon mechanism is implemented by a stream of units which monitors the state of the dot and depending on its state, changes the tunneling barriers Γ_ν to make electronic transport against the bias possible. In absence of the demon mechanism, the tunneling barriers would not depend on the state of the dot and electrons would flow from left to right. The picture of the demon was provided by courtesy of Ania Brzezinska.

At the beginning of the interaction interval, we assume that the interaction produces an instantaneous unitary operation $U_{\rm ms} = \Pi_E \otimes \mathbf{1}_U + \Pi_F \otimes \sigma_U^x$ where $\Pi_E = |E\rangle_S\langle E|$ and $\Pi_F = |F\rangle_S\langle F|$ and $\sigma_U^x = |0\rangle_U\langle 1| + |1\rangle_U\langle 0|$, which can be interpreted as a measurement. Indeed, considering an initial system state of the form $\rho_S(t) = p_E(t)\Pi_E + p_F(t)\Pi_F$ where $p_E(t)$ [$p_F(t)$] is the probability to find the system in the empty [filled] state, the post measurement state of the system and unit reads

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{SU}^{\rm ms}(t) = (1-\epsilon)p_E(t)\Pi_E \otimes \Pi_0 + \epsilon p_E(t)\Pi_E \otimes \Pi_1 \\ + (1-\epsilon)p_F(t)\Pi_F \otimes \Pi_1 + \epsilon p_F(t)\Pi_F \otimes \Pi_0.\end{aligned} \tag{152}$$

Note that $\epsilon = 0$ corresponds to a perfect measurement in which the state of the unit after the measurement is 0 (1) if and only if the state of the system is E (F). The reduced state of the system is always given by $\rho_S^{\rm ms}(t) = {\rm tr}_U\{\rho_{SU}^{\rm ms}(t)\} = \rho_S(t)$, which means that the measurement *does not disturb the system*. This feature circumvents the difficulty mentioned in Sec. V B 1 and allows us to consider a continuously measured system in which δt (the waiting time between two units) can be arbitrarily small despite the fact that the system is still interacting with its environment.

Next, in spirit of Sec. IV E and Eq. (63), we postulate a Hamiltonian of the form $H_{\rm fb} = \epsilon_S|F\rangle_S\langle F| + \Pi_0 H_{SR}^{(0)} + \Pi_1 H_{SR}^{(1)} + H_R$ which acts during the remaining interaction time δt and changes the system reservoir coupling $H_{SR}^{(i)}$ according to the state i of the unit. Assuming that we can treat $H_{SR}^{(i)}$ as a weak perturbation, we are effectively changing the tunneling rates from Γ_ν to $\Gamma_\nu^{(i)}$ and the time evolution of the system and unit is then given by

$$\rho_{SU}(t+\delta t) = \sum_{i\in\{0,1\}} \exp\left\{\mathcal{L}_\beta^{(\nu)}(\Gamma_\nu^{(i)})\delta t\right\}\Pi_i \rho_{SU}^{\rm ms}(t)\Pi_i. \tag{153}$$

Tracing over the unit space and expanding this equation to first order in δt (assuming that δt is sufficiently small) yields an effective evolution equation for the system of the form $d_t\rho_S(t) = \mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}\rho_S(t)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff} &\equiv \sum_\nu \mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}^{(\nu)} \\ &= \sum_\nu [(1-\epsilon)\Gamma_\nu^{(1)} + \epsilon\Gamma_\nu^{(0)}](1-f_\nu)\mathcal{D}[|E\rangle_S\langle F|] \\ &\quad + \sum_\nu [(1-\epsilon)\Gamma_\nu^{(0)} + \epsilon\Gamma_\nu^{(1)}]f_\nu\mathcal{D}[|F\rangle_S\langle E|].\end{aligned} \tag{154}$$

This equation is identical to the ME obtained for the system when it is subjected to the capacitive demon mechanism considered in Ref. [127] which results from coarse-graining the demon dot and only retaining the SET degrees of freedom. In the error-free case ($\epsilon = 0$), it also reduces to the effective ME of Ref. [145], but the above procedure constitutes an elegant way to generalize general piecewise-constant feedback schemes [151] to finite detection errors.

We now turn to the thermodynamic analysis of our new demon mechanism. First of all, we can assume that the unit Hamiltonian $H_U \sim \mathbf{1}_U$ is fully degenerate. This implies $d_t E_U = 0$ at all times. Then, during the measurement step, the system and unit correlate such that [see Eq. (60)] $I_{S:U}^{\rm ms} = d_t S_U^{\rm ms}\delta t$, where we used the fact that $d_t S_S^{\rm ms} = 0$ since the system density matrix is left unchanged by the measurement. This correlation can then be exploited during the feedback step. The second law for feedback (65) in our situation reads in a differential form as

$$\dot\Sigma_S^{\rm fb} = \beta(\mu_L - \mu_R)I_L + \frac{I_{S:U}^{\rm ms}}{\delta t} \geq \frac{I_{S:U}^{\rm fb}}{\delta t} \geq 0, \tag{155}$$

where for simplicity we assumed that the system operates at steady state $d_t S_S^{\rm fb} = 0$ and where we used $d_t S_U^{\rm fb} = 0$ because the entropy of the unit does not change during the feedback step. Furthermore, the entropy flow reads $-\beta\dot Q^{(L)} - \beta\dot Q^{(R)} = \beta(\mu_L - \mu_R)I_L$, where I_L is the matter current which entered the system from the left reservoir. Finally, $I_{S:U}^{\rm fb}$ quantifies the remaining system-unit correlations after the feedback step.

In spirit of Eq. (44) it will turn out to be useful to include the final correlation $I_{S:U}^{\rm fb}$ in the second law and to define

$$\dot\Sigma = \beta(\mu_L - \mu_R)I_L + \mathcal{I} \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{I} \equiv \frac{I_{S:U}^{\rm ms} - I_{S:U}^{\rm fb}}{\delta t} \tag{156}$$

Here, the newly defined quantity $\mathcal{I}$ is the rate with which we use up the correlations established during the measurement. $\mathcal{I}$ had not yet been considered in previous works on this system. In fact, the information current in Ref. [122] is purely phenomenological in nature, whereas the information flow in Ref. [118] describes the same quantity but in a bipartite setting. Note that while both terms $\frac{I_{S:U}^{\rm ms}}{\delta t}$ and $\frac{I_{S:U}^{\rm fb}}{\delta t}$ would diverge when $\delta t \to 0$, $\mathcal{I}$ in general remains finite which motivates the use of Eq. (156)



FIG. 8. (Color Online) Plot of the rate of chemical work $\beta(\mu_L-\mu_R)I_L$ (thick and solid black line) and of three different dissipations: the total one generated by the repeated interaction feedback mechanism $\dot{\Sigma}$ (dotted blue line, Eq. (156)), the total one generated by the capacitive feedback mechanism $\dot{\Sigma}^{\rm cap}$ (dashed green line, Refs. [118, 127]), and the "effective" estimate obtained in these two cases if the demon mechanisms were not known $\dot{\Sigma}_S^{\rm eff}$ (dash-dotted red line, Eq. (158) and Ref. [122]). The top row shows these quantities as a function of the bias voltage $V\equiv\mu_L-\mu_R$ for two different measurement errors ϵ. The bottom row shows them as a function of the measurement error $\epsilon\in[0,1/2)$ for two different voltages V. The region in which we *extract* work, is shaded in gray. Other parameters are $\Gamma=1$, $\delta=\ln 2$, $\beta=0.1$ and $U=0.1$ and we choose a symmetric configuration of the bias, $\mu_L=\epsilon_S+V/2$ and $\mu_R=\epsilon_S-V/2$, effectively eliminating the dependence on ϵ_S in the equations.

instead of Eq. (155). More specifically, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}&=(1-\epsilon)\sum_\nu\Big\{\Gamma_\nu^{(0)}f_\nu p_E+\Gamma_\nu^{(1)}(1-f_\nu)p_F\Big\}\ln\frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}\\&\quad-\epsilon\sum_\nu\Big\{\Gamma_\nu^{(0)}(1-f_\nu)p_F+\Gamma_\nu^{(1)}f_\nu p_E\Big\}\ln\frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}\\&=2\Gamma(1-2\epsilon)\arctan(1-2\epsilon)\\&\quad\times\left(\cosh\delta-(1-2\epsilon)\sinh\delta\tanh\frac{\beta V}{4}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{157}$$

For the last equality we used the steady state solution of p_E and p_F and parametrized the rates as $\Gamma_L^{(0)}\equiv\Gamma_R^{(1)}\equiv\Gamma e^{-\delta}$ and $\Gamma_L^{(1)}\equiv\Gamma_R^{(0)}\equiv\Gamma e^{\delta}$, such that $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$ characterizes a feedback strength. Note that $\mathcal{I}$ diverges for $\epsilon\to 0$. This makes sense because if we monitor the quantum dot in an error-free way, we can also extract an infinite amount of work by letting $\delta\to\infty$.

It is now interesting to compare the total entropy production generated by the two different electronic demon mechanisms, i.e., the one due to capacitive coupling with another quantum dot [127], denoted here as $\dot{\Sigma}^{\rm cap}$, and the one generated by repeated interactions considered above, $\dot{\Sigma}$. These two entropy productions can then be compared to the effective one $\dot{\Sigma}_S^{\rm eff}$, obtained when the demon mechanism is not known and the only information at hand is that of the system's effective description. The best one can do in this case is to derive an "effective" second law in spirit of Eq. (97) or of Ref. [122] which at steady state can be written as

$$\dot{\Sigma}_S^{\rm eff}\equiv\sum_\nu{\rm tr}_S\{(\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}^{(\nu)}\bar{\rho})\ln\bar{\rho}_\nu\}\geq 0\tag{158}$$

and is equivalent to Eq. (14) of Ref. [127]. Here $\bar{\rho}$ is the steady state fulfilling $\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}\bar{\rho}=0$ and $\bar{\rho}_\nu$ is the steady state with respect to reservoir ν, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_{\rm eff}^{(\nu)}\bar{\rho}_\nu=0$. Since this "effective" approach only quantifies the demon effect on the system and neglects the demon's dissipation, it will typically underestimate the true dissipation [126, 127].

To make the comparison between the various dissipations meaningful, we must compare them in the regime where they all give rise to the same effective dynamics on the system, i.e., to the same ME (154). For the repeated interaction mechanism, $\dot{\Sigma}$ is given by (156) while the effective dissipation $\dot{\Sigma}_S^{\rm eff}$ is given by (158). For the capacitive mechanism, $\dot{\Sigma}^{\rm cap}$ is given by Eq. (7) in Ref. [127] in the fast demon limit $\Gamma_D\to\infty$, which is required to derive the ME (154). In this limit $\dot{\Sigma}^{\rm cap}$ also coincides with Eq. (24) in Ref. [118] and therefore gives it an alternative interpretation in terms of the flow of mutual information. Note that we can link the measurement error ϵ to the parameters used in Ref. [118] via the relation $\beta_D U=2\ln\frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}$. The comparison is done in Fig. 8. We observe that the effective second law $\dot{\Sigma}_S^{\rm eff}$ greatly underestimates the true entropy production as expected, but also that the total entropy production generated by the two different demon mechanisms, $\dot{\Sigma}$ and $\dot{\Sigma}^{\rm cap}$, are remarkably close.

VII. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Connection to traditional thermodynamics

In Sec. IV A we have seen that, if the units are initially thermal, then our engine cannot surpass Carnot efficiency and deviations of the final unit state from the ideal thermal reservoir (i.e., nonequilibrium effects) always cause an even *smaller* efficiency. However, if the units are prepared in an arbitrary state, we found that one can continuously extract work from a single heat reservoir by lowering the nonequilibrium free energy of the units according to Eq. (46). We explained that this does not violate the second law of thermodynamics because the overall entropy does not decrease. One may nevertheless wonder however, if this contradicts the classical formulation of the second law according to Kelvin and Planck stating that: *There is no cyclic process in nature whose sole result is the conversion of heat from a single reservoir into work.*



FIG. 9. (Color Online) Sketch of the setup to demonstrate the Kelvin-Planck statement of the second law: the outgoing units U' after the interaction with system S are reset to the state U via interaction with a second system S' coupled to the same thermal reservoir as S.

To answer, let us close the "cycle of units" by feeding the outgoing units back into the system S after they have interacted with an additional system S' in contact with the same overall heat reservoir at temperature T, as illustrated on Fig. 9. We assume to be at steady state and denote the outgoing units after the interaction with system S by U', which are in turn the incoming units for system S'. The outgoing units of S' are then denoted U, which correspond to the incoming units of S. Then, for S and S' we find the two separate second laws (46)

$$\beta(W - \Delta F_U) \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) \geq 0\,, \tag{159}$$
$$\beta(W' - \Delta F_{U'}) \geq I_{S':U'}(\tau) \geq 0 \tag{160}$$

which, when added together and using $\Delta F_{U'} = F_U - F_{U'} = -\Delta F_U$, lead to

$$\beta(W + W') \geq I_{S:U}(\tau) + I_{S':U'}(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{161}$$

Hence, although W might be negative, the sum $W + W'$ must be positive in perfect agreement with the Kelvin-Planck statement of the second law of thermodynamics.

B. Quantum versus Classical Thermodynamics

At this point it is worth revisiting the debated question of whether quantum thermodynamics offers advantages (e.g., in terms of a higher power output or efficiency) in comparison to classical thermodynamics. There is ample evidence that states with quantum properties such as entanglement, coherence or squeezing can be used to extract more work than from thermal states, see e.g. Refs. [21–26, 141–143, 152, 153] (and also Sec. VI C). However, this by no means implies that quantum thermodynamics outperforms classical thermodynamics. Indeed, classical nonequilibrium properties are usually not considered, but if one only allows for nonequilibrium properties which are of a purely quantum origin, this amounts to an unfair competition. In the repeated interaction framework the nonequilibrium free energy (21) captures both quantum and classical effects and we will now use it to analyze the thermodynamics of work extraction. Note that, despite its limitations, the framework fully captures quantum effects in the unit state and in the system-unit interaction.

In the ideal scenario where no final system-unit correlations are present (since they always degrade the amount of extractable work)[9] the second law (46) bounds the extractable work as

$$-W \leq -\Delta F_U = F_U(0) - F_U(\tau). \tag{162}$$

The extractable work $-W$ gets therefore maximized for a maximum initial and minimum final nonequilibrium free energy. The relevant question is therefore whether this procedure can be improved due to quantum effects?

Let us consider an arbitrary unit which has N levels and a Hamiltonian $H_U = \sum_n E_n |n\rangle\langle n|$ with $E_1 \leq \cdots \leq E_N$. The state with maximum free energy corresponds to a state with maximum energy and minimum entropy as we can easily infer from Eq. (21). This state is given by $\rho_U(0) = |N\rangle\langle N|$ and thus, is also an allowed classical state.[10] Finding the state with minimum free energy is more tricky and in general context dependent. We can nevertheless easily show that the state with minimum free energy must be "classical". For this purpose lets define classical states as states which are diagonal in the energy eigenbasis, i.e., states which can be written as $\rho_{\rm cl} = \sum_n p_n |n\rangle\langle n|$. Lets denote by $\rho_{\rm QM}$ quantum states (i.e., states for which there exists $n \neq m$ such that $\langle n|\rho_{\rm QM}|m\rangle \neq 0$) which minimize the nonequilibrium free energy. Its corresponding classical state (obtained by neglecting all coherences) is given by $\rho_{\rm cl} = \sum_n \langle n|\rho_{\rm QM}|n\rangle |n\rangle\langle n|$. If we now assume that the nonequilibrium free energy corresponding to $\rho_{\rm QM}$ is strictly smaller than that of $\rho_{\rm cl}$, we get

$$E(\rho_{\rm QM}) - E(\rho_{\rm cl}) < T[S(\rho_{\rm QM}) - S(\rho_{\rm cl})]. \tag{163}$$

By construction we know that the left hand side is zero since

$$E(\rho_{\rm QM}) = {\rm tr}\{H_U \rho_{QM}\} = \sum_n E_n \langle n|\rho_{\rm QM}|n\rangle = E(\rho_{\rm cl}). \tag{164}$$

Since furthermore, for projective measurements we have that $S(\rho_{\rm QM}) < S(\rho_{\rm cl})$ (Theorem 11.9 in [39]), Eq. (163)

[9] We note that the maximum value of the quantum mutual information $I_{S:U}$ can be twice as large as its classical counterpart. Thus, quantum correlations in the outgoing state have the potential to degrade the amount of extractable work to a larger extend then classical ones.

[10] If the highest energy belongs to a degenerate subspace, i.e., $E_N = E_{N-1} = \ldots$, then there is an additional freedom in the choice of $\rho_U(0)$ which, however, does not change the nonequilibrium free energy.

leads to a contradiction and the state of minimum free energy must necessarily be classical.

We thus proved that for work extraction within our framework there is no benefit in using quantum over classical "resources". That is to say, for any scenario where quantum effects are used to extract work, there is an equivalent classical scenario thinkable (using classical units with the *same* number N of basis states but perhaps a different interaction) which extracts at least the same amount of work.

C. Summary and outlook

We start by summarizing the paper together with its key results. In Sec. II, we reviewed the exact identities describing the correlated dynamics of two interacting systems, one of which could be considered as a reservoir that is initially thermal. We also considered the weak-coupling limit which implicitly assumes macroscopic reservoirs. In Sec. III, we extended these concepts to describe a system which in addition of being continuously interacting with an initially thermal reservoir is subjected to repeated interactions with identical units prepared in arbitrary states. By establishing exact energy and entropy balances, we showed that the stream of units can be seen as a nonequilibrium reservoir or a resource of free energy. In Sec. IV, we identified the limits where these units operate as a pure work, heat or information reservoir and also formulated Landauer's principle. Most importantly, we showed that our setup can be used to formulate quantum feedback control in the limit where the units operate as an information reservoir, and derived a new generalized bound for the extracted work.

Up to that point, the discussion was based on exact identities which are conceptually powerful but of limited practical use. In Sec. V, we started focusing on limits where the system obeys a closed effective dynamics. We derived effective MEs for the system and established their corresponding thermodynamics: This has been done in Subsec. V A when the system weakly and continuously interacts with a thermal reservoir while rarely interacting with units arriving at Poisson distributed times, and in Subsec. V B when the system frequently interacts solely with the units. We also discussed in Subsec. V C the limit where a time dependent system Hamiltonian can be effectively mimicked by a stream of units behaving as a pure work source.

Finally, in Sec. VI we used our framework to analyze important models which were previously considered for their non-conventional thermodynamic features. In Subsec. VI A we proposed a microscopic model effectively implementing the Mandal-Jarzynski engine. We showed that the work extracted from the entropy of the tape originates from the switching on and off of the system-unit interaction. In Subsec. VI B we used our framework to study the thermodynamics of the micromaser which is probably the most popular setup making use of repeated interaction. Building on an extension of this model, we showed in Subsec. VI C that work can be extracted from purely quantum features based on the idea of "lasing without inversion". Finally, in Subsec. VI D we considered a Maxwell demon effect on an electronic current crossing a single level quantum dot which was theoretically studied in the past and also experimentally realized. We analyzed this effect thermodynamically when the demon mechanism is operated by the repeated interactions with a stream of units and showed how it differs from the previously considered mechanisms.

The framework of repeated interactions presented in this paper is quite general and provides a unifying picture for many problems currently encountered in the literature. It nevertheless has limitations. For instance, our results crucially rely on the fact that the individual units in the incoming stream are decorrelated. This assumption is often justified, but recent works started to investigate the role of correlated units, classically [154–158] as well as quantum mechanically [159]. This leads in general to a refined second law with tighter bounds on the amount of extractable work [154, 155, 158]. The cost for creating these correlated units ("patterns") was considered in Ref. [156], and Ref. [157] showed a simple device to exploit these based on techniques of predictive coding (which is a special coding technique, see, e.g., Sec. 4.7.2 in Ref. [72]). Finally, Ref. [159] investigated a model where work extraction and information erasure is simultaneously possible (and is even enhanced by quantum correlations).

Another limitation of our results when deriving effective master equations is that, although system-unit interactions can be arbitrary strong, the system-reservoir interaction must be weak and the resulting dynamics Markovian. Uzdin *et al.* [160] recently tried to tackle this issue via "heat exchangers" which could be strongly coupled to the system and which are equivalent to our units. Therefore, their work faces similar limitations as ours. Besides few exact identities, the correct thermodynamic description of a system in strong contact with a continuous (perhaps non-Markovian) reservoir is still an open and active field of research [161–173].

As a final remark, let us note that connecting our present work to the recently developed quantum resource theories [34, 35] is an interesting perspective. The goal of these theories is to give a rigorous axiomatic mathematical framework to study quantum thermodynamics by studying the interconvertibility of states under certain constraints. Each resource theory consists of three ingredients [174]: a set of freely available states (e.g., thermal states), a set of allowed transformations (e.g., energy preserving unitaries, coupling and decoupling systems, and tracing over subsystems), and a set of resource states (e.g., all states other than the thermal state). One easily sees that the basic ingredients of this approach can also be found in our framework, which is formulated in a non-axiomatic way, but is also much closer to experiments.

Acknowledgements

This work benefited from the COST Action MP1209. Financial support of the DFG (SCHA 1646/3-1, SFB 910, and GRK 1558), of the National Research Fund Luxembourg (project FNR/A11/02) and of the European Research Council (project 681456) is gratefully acknowledged.

[1] M. Esposito, U. Harbola, and S. Mukamel, "Nonequilibrium fluctuations, fluctuation theorems and counting statistics in quantum systems," Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1665 (2009).

[2] M. Campisi, P. Hänggi, and P. Talkner, "Colloquium: Quantum fluctuation relations: Foundations and applications," Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 771 (2011).

[3] C. Jarzynski, "Equalities and inequalities: irreversibility and the second law of thermodynamics at the nanoscale," Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **2**, 329–351 (2011).

[4] U. Seifert, "Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines," Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 126001 (2012).

[5] C. Van den Broeck and M. Esposito, "Ensemble and trajectory thermodynamics: A brief introduction," Physica (Amsterdam) **418A**, 6–16 (2015).

[6] R. Kosloff, "Quantum thermodynamics: A dynamical viewpoint," Entropy **15**, 2100–2128 (2013).

[7] G. Schaller, *Open Quantum Systems Far from Equilibrium* (Lect. Notes Phys., Springer, Cham, 2014).

[8] D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, W. Niedenzu, and G. Kurizki, "Chapter twelve – thermodynamics of quantum systems under dynamical control," Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **64**, 329 (2015).

[9] C. Bustamante, J. Liphardt, and F. Ritort, "The nonequilibrium thermodynamics of small systems," Phys. Today **58**, 43–48 (2005).

[10] H. Ge, M. Qian, and H. Qian, "Stochastic theory of nonequilibrium steady states. part ii: Applications in chemical biophysics," Phys. Rep. **510**, 87–118 (2012).

[11] S. Ciliberto, R. Gomez-Solano, and A. Petrosyan, "Fluctuations, linear response and currents in out-of-equilibrium systems," Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys. **4**, 235–261 (2013).

[12] J. P. Pekola, "Towards quantum thermodynamics in electronic circuits," Nat. Phys. **11**, 118–123 (2015).

[13] H. Thierschmann, R. Sánchez, B. Sothmann, H. Buhmann, and L. W. Molenkamp, "Thermoelectrics with Coulomb coupled quantum dots," arXiv: 1603.08900 (2016).

[14] M. Serra-Garcia, A. Foehr, M. Molerón, J. Lydon, C. Chong, and C. Daraio, "Mechanical autonomous stochastic heat engine," Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 010602 (2016).

[15] J. Roßnagel, S. T. Dawkins, K. N. Tolazzi, O. Abah, E. Lutz, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and K. Singer, "A single-atom heat engine," Science **352**, 325–329 (2016).

[16] C. H. Bennett, "The thermodynamics of computation – a review," Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 905 (1982).

[17] T. Sagawa, "Thermodynamic and logical reversibilities revisited," J. Stat. Mech. **P03025** (2014).

[18] H. S. Leff and A. F. Rex, eds., *Maxwell's Demon 2: Entropy, Classical and Quantum Information, Computing* (IOP Publishing, Bristol, 2003).

[19] K. Maruyama, F. Nori, and V. Vedral, "Colloquium: The physics of Maxwell's demon and information," Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1 (2009).

[20] J. M. R. Parrondo, J. M. Horowitz, and T. Sagawa, "Thermodynamics of information," Nat. Phys. **11**, 131–139 (2015).

[21] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, "Extracting work from a single heat bath via vanishing quantum coherence," Science **299**, 862–864 (2003).

[22] R. Dillenschneider and E. Lutz, "Energetics of quantum correlations," Europhys. Lett. **88**, 50003 (2009).

[23] J. Roßnagel, O. Abah, F. Schmidt-Kaler, K. Singer, and E. Lutz, "Nanoscale heat engine beyond the Carnot limit," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 030602 (2014).

[24] H. Li, J. Zou, W.-L. Yu, B.-M. Xu, J.-G. Li, and B. Shao, "Quantum coherence rather than quantum correlations reflect the effects of a reservoir on a system's work capability," Phys. Rev. E **89**, 052132 (2014).

[25] G. Manzano, F. Galve, R. Zambrini, and J. M. R. Parrondo, "Entropy production and thermodynamic power of the squeezed thermal reservoir," Phys. Rev. E **93**, 052120 (2016).

[26] W. Niedenzu, A. G. Kofman D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, and G. Kurizki, "On the operation of machines powered by quantum non-thermal baths," New J. Phys. **18**, 083012 (2016).

[27] D. Meschede, H. Walther, and G. Müller, "One-atom maser," Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 551–554 (1985).

[28] P. Filipowicz, J. Javanainen, and P. Meystre, "Theory of a microscopic maser," Phys. Rev. A **34**, 3077–3087 (1986).

[29] M. O. Scully and M. Suhail Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).

[30] C. Sayrin, I. Dotsenko, X. Zhou, B. Peaudecerf, T. Rybarczyk, S. Gleyzes, P. Rouchon, M. Mirrahimi, H. Amini, M. Brune, J.-M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, "Real-time quantum feedback prepares and stabilizes photon number states," Nature **477**, 73–77 (2011).

[31] D. Mandal and C. Jarzynski, "Work and information processing in a solvable model of Maxwell's demon," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **109**, 11641–11645 (2012).

[32] D. Mandal, H. T. Quan, and C. Jarzynski, "Maxwell's refrigerator: An exactly solvable model," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 030602 (2013).

[33] P. Strasberg, J. Cerrillo, G. Schaller, and T. Brandes, "Thermodynamics of stochastic Turing machines," Phys. Rev. E **92**, 042104 (2015).

[34] G. Gour, M. P. Müller, V. Narasimhachar, R. W. Spekkens, and N. Y. Halpern, "The resource theory of informational nonequilibrium in thermodynamics," Phys. Rep. **583**, 1–58 (2015).

[35] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. del Rio, and P. Skrzypzyk, "The role of quantum information in thermodynamics – a topical review," J. Phys. A **49**, 143001

(2016).
[36] R. Uzdin and R. Kosloff, "The multilevel four-stroke swap engine and its environment," New J. Phys. **16**, 095003 (2014).
[37] R. S. Whitney, "Most efficient quantum thermoelectric at finite power output," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 130601 (2014).
[38] K. Kraus, *States, Effects and Operations: Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1983).
[39] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[40] V. Vedral, "The role of relative entropy in quantum information theory," Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 197 (2002).
[41] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
[42] G. Lindblad, "Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities," Commun. Math. Phys. **40**, 147–151 (1975).
[43] M. Esposito, K. Lindenberg, and C. Van den Broeck, "Entropy production as correlation between system and reservoir," New J. Phys. **12**, 013013 (2010).
[44] S. Deffner and C. Jarzynski, "Information processing and the second law of thermodynamics: An inclusive, Hamiltonian approach," Phys. Rev. X **3**, 041003 (2013).
[45] D. Reeb and M. M. Wolf, "An improved Landauer principle with finite-size corrections," New J. Phys. **16**, 103011 (2014).
[46] D. Kondepudi and I. Prigogine, *Modern Thermodynamics: From Heat Engines to Dissipative Structures* (John Wiley & Sons, West Sussex, 2007).
[47] B. Gaveau and L. S. Schulman, "A general framework for non-equilibrium phenomena: The master equation and its formal consequences," Phys. Lett. A **229**, 347–353 (1997).
[48] G. E. Crooks, "Beyond boltzmann-gibbs statistics: Maximum entropy hyperensembles out of equilibrium," Phys. Rev. E **75**, 041119 (2007).
[49] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, "Second law and Landauer principle far from equilibrium," Europhys. Lett. **95**, 40004 (2011).
[50] H. Spohn and J. L. Lebowitz, "Irreversible thermodynamics for quantum systems weakly coupled to thermal reservoirs," Adv. Chem. Phys. **38**, 109–142 (1979).
[51] R. Alicki, "The quantum open system as a model of the heat engine," J. Phys. A **12**, L103 (1979).
[52] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
[53] G. Lindblad, "On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups," Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
[54] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, "Completely positive dynamical semigroups of n-level systems," J. Math. Phys. **17**, 821 (1976).
[55] H. Spohn, "Entropy production for quantum dynamical semigroups," J. Math. Phys. **19**, 1227–1230 (1978).
[56] F. Haupt, M. Leijnse, H. L. Calvo, L. Classen, J. Splettstoesser, and M. R. Wegewijs, "Heat, molecular vibrations and adiabatic driving in nonequilibrium transport through interacting quantum dots," Phys. Status Solidi B **250**, 2315–2329 (2013).
[57] M. Yamaguchi, T. Yuge, and T. Ogawa, "Markovian quantum master equation beyond adiabatic regime," arXiv: 1604.01082 (2016).
[58] K. Szczygielski, D. Gelbwaser-Klimovsky, and R. Alicki, "Markovian master equation and thermodynamics of a two-level system in a strong laser field," Phys. Rev. E **87**, 012120 (2013).
[59] G. Bulnes Cuetara, A. Engel, and M. Esposito, "Stochastic thermodynamics of rapidly driven quantum systems," New J. Phys. **17**, 055002 (2015).
[60] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, "Nonequilibrium entropy production for open quantum systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 140404 (2011).
[61] D. Petz, "Monotonicity of quantum relative entropy revisited," Reviews in Mathematical Physics **15**, 79–91 (2003).
[62] A. Sommerfeld, *Atomic Structure and Spectral Lines* (Methuen & Co Ltd, London, 1923).
[63] A. E. Allahverdyan and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, "Fluctuations of work from quantum subensembles: The case against quantum work-fluctuation theorems," Phys. Rev. E **71**, 066102 (2005).
[64] P. Talkner, E. Lutz, and P. Hänggi, "Fluctuation theorems: Work is not an observable," Phys. Rev. E **75**, 050102(R) (2007).
[65] H. Weimer, M. J. Henrich, F. Rempp, H. Schröder, and G. Mahler, "Local effective dynamics of quantum systems: A generalized approach to work and heat," Europhys. Lett. **83**, 30008 (2008).
[66] H. Schröder and G. Mahler, "Work exchange between quantum systems: The spin-oscillator model," Phys. Rev. E **81**, 021118 (2010).
[67] J. Salmilehto, P. Solinas, and M. Möttönen, "Quantum driving and work," Phys. Rev. E **89**, 052128 (2014).
[68] H. Hossein-Nejad, E. J. O'Reilly, and A. Olaya-Castro, "Work, heat and entropy production in bipartite quantum systems," New J. Phys. **17**, 075014 (2015).
[69] R. Gallego, J. Eisert, and H. Wilming, "Thermodynamic work from operational principles," arXiv: 1504.05056 (2015).
[70] C. Jarzynski, H. T. Quan, and S. Rahav, "The quantum-classical correspondence principle for work distributions," Phys. Rev. X **5**, 031038 (2015).
[71] C. E. Shannon, "A mathematical theory of communication," Bell System Tech. J. **27**, 379 (1948).
[72] R. P. Feynman, *Feynman Lectures on Computation* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, 1996).
[73] J. Hoppenau and A. Engel, "On the energetics of information exchange," Europhys. Lett. **105**, 50002 (2014).
[74] M. O. Scully, "Extracting work from a single thermal bath via quantum negentropy," Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 220601 (2001).
[75] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, "An autonomous and reversible Maxwell's demon," Europhys. Lett. **101**, 60001 (2013).
[76] S. Deffner, "Information-driven current in a quantum Maxwell demon," Phys. Rev. E **88**, 062128 (2013).
[77] Z. Lu, D. Mandal, and C. Jarzynski, "Engineering Maxwell's demon," Phys. Today **67**, 60 (2014).
[78] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, "Stochastic thermodynamics with information reservoirs," Phys. Rev. E **90**, 042150 (2014).
[79] P. Strasberg, G. Schaller, T. Brandes, and C. Jarzynski, "The second laws for an information driven current through a spin valve," Phys. Rev. E **90**, 062107 (2014).

[80] Y. Cao, Z. Gong, and H. T. Quan, "Thermodynamics of information processing based on enzyme kinetics: An exactly solvable model of an information pump," Phys. Rev. E **91**, 062117 (2015).

[81] R. Landauer, "Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process," IBM J. Res. Dev. **5**, 183 (1961).

[82] R. W. Keyes and R. Landauer, "Minimal energy dissipation in logic," IBM J. Res. Dev. **14**, 152 (1970).

[83] K. Likharev, "Classical and quantum limitations on energy consumption in computation," Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 311 (1982).

[84] K. Shizume, "Heat generation required by information erasure," Phys. Rev. E **52**, 3495 (1995).

[85] B. Piechocinska, "Information erasure," Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062314 (2000).

[86] M. B. Plenio and V. Vitelli, "The physics of forgetting: Landauer's erasure principle and information theory," Contemp. Phys. **42**, 25–60 (2001).

[87] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, "Minimal energy cost for thermodynamic information processing: measurement and information erasure," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 250602 (2009).

[88] E. Aurell, K. Gawedzki, C. Mejía-Monasterio, R. Mohayaee, and P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, "Refined second law of thermodynamics for fast random processes," J. Stat. Phys. **147**, 487 (2012).

[89] G. Diana, G. B. Bagci, and M. Esposito, "Finite-time erasing of information stored in fermionic bits," Phys. Rev. E **87**, 012111 (2013).

[90] E. Hanson, A. Joye, Y. Pautrat, and R. Raquépas, "Landauer's principle in repeated interaction systems," arXiv: 1510.00533 (2015).

[91] A. O. Orlov, C. S. Lent, C. C. Thorpe, G. P. Boechler, and G. L. Snider, "Experimental test of Landauer's principle at the sub-k_bT level," Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **51**, 06FE10 (2012).

[92] A. Bérut, A. Arakelyan, A. Petrosyan, S. Ciliberto, R. Dillenschneider, and E. Lutz, "Experimental verification of Landauer's principle linking information and thermodynamics," Nature (London) **483**, 187–189 (2012).

[93] Y. Jun, M. Gavrilov, and J. Bechhoefer, "High-precision test of Landauer's principle in a feedback trap," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 190601 (2014).

[94] J. P. P. Silva, R. S. Sarthour, A. M. Souza, I. S. Oliveira, J. Goold, K. Modi, D. O. Soares-Pinto, and L. C. Céleri, "Experimental demonstration of information to energy conversion in a quantum system at the Landauer limit," Proc. R. Soc. A **472**, 20150813 (2016).

[95] J. Hong, B. Lambson, S. Dhuey, and J. Bokor, "Experimental verification of Landauer's principle in erasure of nanomagnetic memory bits," arXiv: 1411.6730 (2014).

[96] A. Bérut, A. Petrosyan, and S. Ciliberto, "Information and thermodynamics: Experimental verification of Landauer's erasure principle," J. Stat. Mech. **P06015** (2015).

[97] J. D. Norton, "All shook up: Fluctuations, Maxwell's demon and the thermodynamics of computation," Entropy **15**, 4432 (2013).

[98] L. Del Rio, J. Åberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral, "The thermodynamic meaning of negative entropy," Nature (London) **474**, 61–63 (2011).

[99] S. Lloyd, "Use of mutual information to decrease entropy: Implications for the second law of thermodynamics," Phys. Rev. A **39**, 5378–5386 (1989).

[100] H. Touchette and S. Lloyd, "Information-theoretic limits of control," Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1156 (2000).

[101] H. Touchette and S. Lloyd, "Information-theoretic approach to the study of control systems," Physica A **331**, 140–172 (2004).

[102] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, "Second law of thermodynamics with discrete quantum feedback control," Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080403 (2008).

[103] F. J. Cao and M. Feito, "Thermodynamics of feedback controlled systems," Phys. Rev. E **79**, 041118 (2009).

[104] K. Jacobs, "Second law of thermodynamics and quantum feedback control: Maxwell's demon with weak measurements," Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012322 (2009).

[105] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, "Generalized Jarzynski equality under nonequilibrium feedback control," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 090602 (2010).

[106] S. Deffner and E. Lutz, "Information free energy for nonequilibrium states," arXiv: 1201.3888 (2012).

[107] M. Ponmurugan, "Generalized detailed fluctuation theorem under nonequilibrium feedback control," Phys. Rev. E **82**, 031129 (2010).

[108] J. M. Horowitz and S. Vaikuntanathan, "Nonequilibrium detailed fluctuation theorem for repeated discrete feedback," Phys. Rev. E **82**, 061120 (2010).

[109] D. Abreu and U. Seifert, "Thermodynamics of genuine nonequilibrium states under feedback control," Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 030601 (2012).

[110] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, "Fluctuation theorem with information exchange: Role of correlations in stochastic thermodynamics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 180602 (2012).

[111] T. Sagawa and M. Ueda, "Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of feedback control," Phys. Rev. E **85**, 021104 (2012).

[112] S. Toyabe, T. Sagawa, M. Ueda, E. Muneyuki, and M. Sano, "Experimental demonstration of information-to-energy conversion and validation of the generalized Jarzynski equality," Nat. Phys. **6**, 988–992 (2010).

[113] J. V. Koski, V. F. Maisi, J. P. Pekola, and D. V. Averin, "Experimental realization of a Szilard engine with a single electron," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **111**, 13786–13789 (2014).

[114] J. V. Koski, V. F. Maisi, T. Sagawa, and J. P. Pekola, "Experimental observation of the role of mutual information in the nonequilibrium dynamics of a Maxwell demon," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 030601 (2014).

[115] H. M. Wiseman, *Quantum trajectories and feedback* (PhD thesis, University of Queensland, 1994).

[116] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, "All-optical versus electro-optical feedback," Phys. Rev. A **49**, 4110 (1994).

[117] S. Lloyd, "Coherent quantum feedback," Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022108 (2000).

[118] J. M. Horowitz and M. Esposito, "Thermodynamics with continuous information flow," Phys. Rev. X **4**, 031015 (2014).

[119] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, "Unifying three perspectives on information processing in stochastic thermodynamics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 090601 (2014).

[120] J. M. Horowitz and H. Sandberg, "Second-law-like inequalities with information and their interpretations," New J. Phys. **16**, 125007 (2014).

[121] N. Shiraishi, T. Matsumoto, and T. Sagawa, "Measurement-feedback formalism meets information reservoirs," New J. Phys. **18**, 013044 (2016).

[122] M. Esposito and G. Schaller, "Stochastic thermodynamics for "Maxwell demon" feedbacks," Europhys. Lett. **99**, 30003 (2012).

[123] T. Munakata and M. L. Rosinberg, "Entropy production and fluctuation theorems under feedback control: the molecular refrigerator model revisited," J. Stat. Mech. **P05010** (2012).

[124] P. Strasberg, G. Schaller, T. Brandes, and M. Esposito, "Thermodynamics of quantum-jump-conditioned feedback control," Phys. Rev. E **88**, 062107 (2013).

[125] T. Munakata and M. L. Rosinberg, "Feedback cooling, measurement errors and entropy production," J. Stat. Mech. **P06014** (2013).

[126] M. Esposito, "Stochastic thermodynamics under coarse graining," Phys. Rev. E **85**, 041125 (2012).

[127] P. Strasberg, G. Schaller, T. Brandes, and M. Esposito, "Thermodynamics of a physical model implementing a maxwell demon," Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 040601 (2013).

[128] D. Hartich, A. C. Barato, and U. Seifert, "Stochastic thermodynamics of bipartite systems: transfer entropy inequalities and a Maxwell's demon interpretation," J. Stat. Mech. **P02016** (2014).

[129] N. Shiraishi and T. Sagawa, "Fluctuation theorem for partially masked nonequilibrium dynamics," Phys. Rev. E **91**, 012130 (2015).

[130] J. M. Horowitz, "Multipartite information flow for multiple Maxwell demons," J. Stat. Mech. **P03006** (2015).

[131] F. Barra, "The thermodynamic cost of driving quantum systems by their boundaries," Sci. Rep. **5**, 14873 (2015).

[132] P. Filipowicz, J. Javanainen, and P. Meystre, "Quantum and semiclassical steady states of a kicked cavity mode," J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **3**, 906 (1986).

[133] G. J. Milburn, "Kicked quantized cavity mode: An open-systems-theory approach," Phys. Rev. A **36**, 744–749 (1987).

[134] S. Attal and Y. Pautrat, "From repeated to continuous quantum interactions," Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré **7**, 59–104 (2006).

[135] D. Grimmer, D. Layden, E. Martin-Martinez, and R. B. Mann, "Open dynamics under rapid repeated interaction," arXiv: 1605.04302 (2016).

[136] D. Karevski and T. Platini, "Quantum nonequilibrium steady states induced by repeated interactions," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 207207 (2009).

[137] J. M. Horowitz, "Quantum-trajectory approach to the stochastic thermodynamics of a forced harmonic oscillator," Phys. Rev. E **85**, 031110 (2012).

[138] J. M. Horowitz and J. M. R. Parrondo, "Entropy production along nonequilibrium quantum jump trajectories," New J. Phys. **15**, 085028 (2013).

[139] D. A. Rodrigues, J. Imbers, and A. D. Armour, "Quantum dynamics of a resonator driven by a superconducting single-electron transistor: A solid-state analogue of the micromaser," Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 067204 (2007).

[140] G. Rempe, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and H. Walther, "Observation of sub-poissonian photon statistics in a micromaser," Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2783–2786 (1990).

[141] Marlan O. Scully, "Quantum photocell: Using quantum coherence to reduce radiative recombination and increase efficiency," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 207701 (2010).

[142] M. O. Scully, K. R. Chapin, K. E. Dorfman, M. B. Kim, and A. Svidzinsky, "Quantum heat engine power can be increased by noise-induced coherence," Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **108**, 15097–15100 (2011).

[143] K. Korzekwa, M. Lostaglio, J. Oppenheim, and D. Jennings, "The extraction of work from quantum coherence," New. J. Phys. **18**, 023045 (2016).

[144] S. Datta, *Nanodevices and Maxwell's Demon* (In Nanoscale Phenomena, pp. 59-81, Springer, New York, 2008).

[145] G. Schaller, C. Emary, G. Kiesslich, and T. Brandes, "Probing the power of an electronic Maxwell's demon: Single-electron transistor monitored by a quantum point contact," Phys. Rev. B **84**, 085418 (2011).

[146] D. V. Averin, M. Möttönen, and J. P. Pekola, "Maxwell's demon based on a single-electron pump," Phys. Rev. B **84**, 245448 (2011).

[147] L. B. Kish and C.-G. Granqvist, "Electrical Maxwell demon and Szilard engine utilizing Johnson noise, measurement, logic and control," PloS one **7**, 10 (2012).

[148] J. Bergli, Y. M. Galperin, and N. B. Kopnin, "Information flow and optimal protocol for a Maxwell-demon single-electron pump," Phys. Rev. E **88**, 062139 (2013).

[149] A. Kutvonen, J. Koski, and T. Ala-Nissilä, "Thermodynamics and efficiency of an autonomous on-chip Maxwell's demon," Sci. Rep. **6**, 21126 (2015).

[150] J. V. Koski, A. Kutvonen, I. M. Khaymovich, T. Ala-Nissila, and J. P. Pekola, "On-chip Maxwell's demon as an information-powered refrigerator," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 260602 (2015).

[151] G. Schaller, "Fighting decoherence by feedback-controlled dissipation," Phys. Rev. A **85**, 062118 (2012).

[152] R. Uzdin, "Coherence-induced reversibility and collective operation of quantum heat machines via coherence recycling," Phys. Rev. Applied **6**, 024004 (2016).

[153] P. Kammerlander and J. Anders, "Coherence and measurement in quantum thermodynamics," Sci. Rep. **6**, 22174 (2016).

[154] N. Merhav, "Sequence complexity and work extraction," J. Stat. Mech. **P06037** (2015).

[155] A. B. Boyd, D. Mandal, and J. P. Crutchfield, "Identifying functional thermodynamics in autonomous Maxwellian ratchets," New. J. Phys. **18**, 023049 (2016).

[156] A. J. Garner, J. Thompson, V. Vedral, and M. Gu, "When is simpler thermodynamically better?" arXiv: 1510.00010 (2015).

[157] P. Strasberg, *Thermodynamics and Information Processing at the Nanoscale* (PhD thesis, TU Berlin, 2015).

[158] A. B. Boyd, D. Mandal, and J. P. Crutchfield, "Correlation-powered information engines and the thermodynamics of self-correction," arXiv: 1606.08506 (2016).

[159] A. Chapman and A. Miyake, "How can an autonomous quantum Maxwell demon harness correlated information?" Phys. Rev. E **92**, 062125 (2015).

[160] R. Uzdin, A. Levy, and R. Kosloff, "Quantum heat machines equivalence, work extraction beyond markovianity and strong coupling via heat exchangers," Entropy **18**, 124 (2016).

[161] C. Jarzynski, "Nonequilibrium work theorem for a system strongly coupled to a thermal environment," J. Stat. Mech. **P09005** (2004).

[162] M. Campisi, P. Talkner, and P. Hänggi, "Fluctuation theorem for arbitrary open quantum systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 210401 (2009).

[163] G. Schaller, T. Krause, T. Brandes, and M. Esposito, "Single-electron transistor strongly coupled to vibrations: counting statistics and fluctuation theorem,"

New J. Phys. **15**, 033032 (2013).
[164] L. Pucci, M. Esposito, and L. Peliti, "Entropy production in quantum brownian motion," J. Stat. Mech. **P04005** (2013).
[165] M. F. Ludovico, J. S. Lim, M. Moskalets, L. Arrachea, and D. Sánchez, "Dynamical energy transfer in ac-driven quantum systems," Phys. Rev. B **89**, 161306 (2014).
[166] T. Krause, T. Brandes, M. Esposito, and G. Schaller, "Thermodynamics of the polaron master equation at finite bias," J. Chem. Phys. **142**, 134106 (2015).
[167] M. Esposito, M. A. Ochoa, and M. Galperin, "Quantum thermodynamics: A nonequilibrium Greens function approach," Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 080602 (2015).
[168] M. Esposito, M. A. Ochoa, and M. Galperin, "Nature of heat in strongly coupled open quantum systems," Phys. Rev. B **92**, 235440 (2015).
[169] A. Bruch, M. Thomas, S. V. Kusminskiy, F. von Oppen, and A. Nitzan, "Quantum thermodynamics of the driven resonant level model," Phys. Rev. B **93**, 115318 (2016).
[170] U. Seifert, "First and second law of thermodynamics at strong coupling," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 020601 (2016).
[171] P. Strasberg, G. Schaller, N. Lambert, and T. Brandes, "Nonequilibrium thermodynamics in the strong coupling and non-Markovian regime based on a reaction coordinate mapping," New. J. Phys. **18**, 073007 (2016).
[172] M. Carrega, P. Solinas, M. Sassetti, and U. Weiss, "Energy exchange in driven open quantum systems at strong coupling," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 240403 (2016).
[173] P. Talkner and P. Hänggi, "Open system trajectories specify fluctuating work but not heat," Phys. Rev. E **94**, 022143 (2016).
[174] F. G. S. L. Brandão and G. Gour, "Reversible framework for quantum resource theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070503 (2015).